

B X

9941

B35

31. BALFOUR'S LETTERS

TO

PROFESSOR STUART.

4

17

31.

2-10-35.

Library of Congress.

Chap. BX9941
Shelf. B35

Copyright No.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.





deposited in Mass. Lib.
Clerk's Office Oct 1891
LETTERS
1833. Dec Vol. 9. p. 85.
TO

REV. MOSES STUART,

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE, IN THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT ANDOVER.

BY WALTER BALFOUR,
OF CHARLESTOWN.

‘Prove all things.’—PAUL.



BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY B. B. MUSSEY, 29, CORNHILL.
G. W. STACY....PRINTER.

1833.

[Illegible handwritten text]

EX 9941
B35

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1833.
BY WALTER BALFOUR,
in the Clerks's office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

1490

2
4
5
LR
4
I

INTRODUCTION.

THE following letters, were published in the Universalist Magazine, in the years 1820, and 1821, and signed '*An Inquirer after truth.*' They were addressed to MOSES STUART, associate Professor of Sacred Literature, in the Theological Seminary at Andover. In presenting them to the public, now in a small book, and with my real name affixed to them, a brief statement of the circumstances which gave rise to them, seems to be necessary. Without this, some might suppose, they were written since I became a Universalist, whereas they were expressly written to avoid becoming one.

Until the year 1819, a serious thought never occupied my mind, that the doctrine of endless punishment might be false. In the belief of this doctrine I had been educated from my childhood. The books I read; the preaching I heard; and all my religious intercourse; tended to deepen my early impressions, that it was scriptural. Believing it to be so, I had preached it for several years both in Scotland and America. In the course of my reading, I had perused several books on the subject of universal restoration, but they only tended to confirm me in the belief, that endless punishment

was true, and that reformation in hell and salvation from it, could not be established from the bible. I deemed Universalism a great error, sometimes discussed the subject with Universalists and always thought I had the best of the argument.

The first thing, which staggered my faith in the doctrine of endless punishment, was reading that paragraph of Mr. Stuart's letters to Dr. Channing quoted in my first letter. His statements, I was unable to controvert, and the texts on which they were founded, seemed to support them. This gave rise to the three first letters, and as the reader will see, they were written to solicit from Mr. Stuart some explanation, and how he reconciled his statements with this doctrine. As he had shaken my faith in it, I thought I had some claim on him to say something to reestablish it.

The signature I assumed, '*An Inquirer after truth*,' though in one sense fictitious, was in another real, for my letters were written in sincerity, anxious to see where the truth lay on this subject. And believing as I had done, that Universalists were in a great error, I was also desirous, that Mr. Stuart should so answer my letters, as to convince them of it. It will be easily perceived by the reader, that the three first letters were only embraced in my original design. The others, were occasioned by observing other things in Mr. Stuart's book, and my own investigations of some Greek phrases; which he had explained. In investigating the scriptural sense of these phrases, my doubts were increased, as to the truth of the doctrine of endless punishment. This

made me still more anxious, that he should come forward with some explanation.

The last of the three first letters, was published in the Magazine for March 4th 1820, to which Mr. Stuart made no reply whatever. After waiting until the 4th of July for some explanation on the subject, I wrote him by mail, urging him to do this. After waiting several months, and still no reply being made, I sent the copy of this letter to the editor of the Magazine for publication. The remaining letters of the whole series soon followed, as their dates show. At last, Mr. Stuart condescended to write a brief note, declining all compliance with my urgent requests for an explanation. This note will be given in its proper place. The reader can judge, whether his professed reasons, for declining all explanation, are satisfactory. In his letter, he blames me for not giving my real name, and seeking a private interview with him for my own satisfaction. My reasons for declining this, are given in the letters, and of them the reader can also judge.

When Mr. Stuart declined all explanation, how he reconciled his statements with the doctrine of endless punishment, I determined to make a pretty thorough examination of the subject for my own satisfaction. The substance of my investigations have been published in my first and second Inquiries, Essays, and other publications. Whether my books, have done any good or evil to the world, they have Mr. Stuart to thank for them. A little timely explanation from him, might have prevented them from being written. When I wrote those

letters, I had as little thought of writing a book in favor of universal salvation, as of creating a new world. All my prejudices, and habits of thinking, as well as my honor and interest, were strongly in favor of the doctrine of endless punishment. To Mr. Stuart of Andover, I am indebted for making me a Universalist, and to him the world are indebted for my books. If I have embraced an error, and have published it to the world, let all who think so, know, that he is the man who led me astray; was urged to give some explanation, but declined it; and that nothing has been said by him or any other person, to shew me my error. His exegetical essays, do not touch the points discussed in the following letters.

But, perhaps it may be asked, why republish these letters? Why not let the subject rest in oblivion? We have several reasons to offer. 1. We have been repeatedly solicited, to republish these letters in pamphlet form, for general circulation. The Magazine in which they first appeared, was not adapted to this; it was read comparatively by few; nor was it preserved by many for future reading. Besides, all know, tracts and pamphlets are widely circulated to put down Universalism, and why should not Universalists circulate some in its defence?

2. Many people know, that I am a Universalist, but a great many of them do not know, Mr. Stuart was the cause of my becoming one. It is nothing more, than a duty I owe to myself and to them, to give them correct information on this subject. It is certainly proper, they should see, that a highly orthodox Professor's statements,

were the occasion of my giving up the doctrine of endless punishment. Many of my former orthodox brethren, and other well meaning people, have condemned me for becoming a Universalist, who may moderate the severity of my condemnation, when they know the real facts of the case. I wish to furnish them with these, and let them judge accordingly. If they believe I have strayed from the truth, let them see who led me astray, and the pains I took to avoid straying. Mr. Stuart certainly was the person who led me into Universalism, and all ought to know, how little he did to prevent it. But

3. The importance of the texts, and Mr. Stuart's comments on them, brought forward in these letters, is the principal reason with me for publishing them. Until his statements and comments, are shown false, Universalism never can be proved unscriptural. They are foundation stones, on which it rests. Mr. Stuart's statements, comments, and principles of scripture interpretation, when universally understood and adopted, must make all men Universalists. Strong as my prejudices were, they were overcome by them. No Universalist wishes his statements altered to suit him. Is it not then proper, these texts with Mr. Stuart's comments, should be generally diffused in the community? Let all see, how much he has done to promote Universalism. But

4. No doubt Mr. Stuart, and many others, still believe Universalism a great error. Well, we publish these letters, to afford Mr. Stuart a fair opportunity, either to retract his statements and comments, or show how he reconciles them with the doctrine of endless punishment.

In his letter, he declares, he had no particular objection, or any fears to discuss the subject. His principal objections are thus stated.' 'But I must know the name and the object of my antagonist, before I enter the lists; and contend on some other ground than that of a newspaper.' These objections I now remove out of Mr. Stuart's way for

1. I now give him my real name affixed to these letters. About this, there can now be no mistake; no fighting in the dark; no discussion with a real name on the one side, and a fictitious one on the other.

The *object* of his antagonist must now also be well known. It has always been, a strong desire to see, how Mr. Stuart reconciled his statements and comments with his belief in the doctrine of endless punishment. Before God and all the world, I still declare this to be my sincere desire.

3. He wished to 'contend on some other ground than that of a newspaper.' This objection is now also removed, by publishing these letters in regular book form. His objections being then removed, we may expect to see, how he makes his statements and comments agree with the endless punishment of a part of mankind. This, we hope Mr. Stuart will now do, seeing the doctrine is an article in the Andover creed, and he is set for the defence of the gospel. This duty he ought to have performed more than ten years ago, and had it been done in a satisfactory manner then, he might have saved me from Universalism.

When Mr. Stuart's exegetical essays were announced,

we expected to see in them a powerful vindication of the doctrine of endless punishment, and also his statements and comments reconciled with it. But we were entirely disappointed. If Mr. Stuart can reconcile them, we shall confess it to be one of the most extraordinary things we have ever seen accomplished. Want of time, can not now be pled as an excuse, for he finds time to write books on far less important subjects. Why not then, make one mighty effort, to refute '*the widely spread belief*' of universal salvation? Stay its progress now, or the United States, the whole world must be filled with this doctrine. Let the reader judge, if Mr. Stuart's statements discussed in the following pages, are not admirably calculated to promote its progress.

Respecting the following letters it is proper to apprise the reader of the following circumstances. 1. When published in the Universalist Magazine, no dates were affixed to them, the one sent by mail to Mr. Stuart excepted. They are now dated according to the time in which they appeared in the Magazine.

2. All the letters, and also Mr. Stuart's note in reply, are given in their regular order, without note, alteration, or addition. We should have preferred making some slight alterations and some considerable additions. But, as it might lead some to say, we had altered the letters, we give them as they appeared in the Magazine, merely correcting the errors of the press, and substituting our own proper name for the fictitious one, '*An Inquirer after truth.*'

3. We have added a number of concluding remarks

founded on some other parts of Mr. Stuart's Letters. We were not aware until we gave them another perusal, that he had said so many things in favor of universal salvation. The candid reader, we think, will consider the concluding remarks a valuable addition to the letters.

WALTER BALFOUR.

Charlestown, July 29, 1833.

LETTER I.

TO MOSES STUART,

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE IN THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AT ANDOVER, MASS.

January 29, 1820.

SIR,—I have read your letters to Mr. Channing. It is not my object to interfere in the controversy between you, but to call your attention to one thing in them, which is not likely to be noticed by your opponents, but which struck my mind with great force while reading them. As the paragraph, is not very long on which I wish to remark I shall quote it. In your third edition, proving that divine honors and worship, are ascribed to Christ, you have the following quotations from scripture, and observations.

‘Phillip, ii : 10, 11, ‘That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.’ Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New-

Testament writers, for the Universe ; (ta pan or ta panta.) What can be meant by things in heaven, i. e. beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant ? What other worship can heaven render ? And if the worship of Christ in heaven be spiritual should not that of others, who ought to be in temper united with them, be spiritual also ? Rev. v : 8—14, ‘ And when he (i. e. Christ, see ver. 6, 7,) took the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sung a new song, saying, thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof : for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation ; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests ; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld and heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders ; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands ; saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for-

ever and ever. And the four beasts said Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth forever and ever.' If this be not *spiritual* worship—and if Christ be not the object of it here ; I am unable to produce a case, where worship can be called spiritual and divine.' pp. 100—103.

Such Sir, are the scriptures you have quoted, and such are the comments you have given, and this is the paragraph, which arrested my attention. Upon reading it, the following ideas rushed into my mind with much violence.—' Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth is a periphrasis for the universe ; this universe worships Christ with spiritual and divine worship, and yet Mr. Stuart believes that many in this very universe, are to be punished in hell for ever. I paused, and concluded, that I certainly must have read or understood you wrong. I returned, and read with careful attention, the whole division of your subject, in which the above quotation occurs, but found to my surprise I had not. After repeated perusals of it, and after much reflection upon it, I am constrained to think, that you either are, or ought to be, a Universalist. Sure I am, that nothing which I have ever read or heard, in so few words, so conclusively establishes the doctrine of universal salvation. Having received the impression, from reading your letters, that you are a candid, honest man, it has led me thus to address you. I cannot suffer myself to think, that you secretly believe all will finally be saved,

and publicly profess to believe a different doctrine. I have concluded, that this passage of your letters, must have been inadvertantly written, or you must have some way of getting rid of difficulties from the texts you have quoted and your comments, of which I candidly confess my ignorance. The object of this correspondence, is to state what has occurred to me, and to request further information from you on this subject.

I am unable to controvert what you say, that, 'things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the universe.' My present degree of knowledge leads me to think, that this statement is correct. If it be not, I should be glad to see the evidence by which it is disproved. Neither can I, nor am I disposed to dispute that the worship spoken of in the texts quoted by you, is spiritual worship. So sure you are of this, that you say, 'if this be not spiritual worship, I am unable to produce a case, where worship can be called spiritual and divine.' Now, my dear Sir, if it be true, that things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis for the universe; and if it also be true, that this worship is spiritual and divine, you certainly have told us, that the universe is to worship Christ with spiritual and divine worship. The worship is spiritual and divine, and the universe are the worshippers. Are we able to avoid this? The mind must be differently constructed

from mine, that can avoid it. Is it, or can it be believed by any one, that any beings in the universe, who worship Christ thus, shall be punished forever? I am sure I never had any such idea; and I have always understood, that it was on account of persons not worshipping Christ in this way, that they were punished. You certainly cannot think, that the punishment of the wicked forever, is in whole or in part to consist, in rendering to Christ spiritual and divine worship. If this be punishment what is happiness? If this be hell, what is heaven?

It is pretty evident to me from these texts which you have quoted, and the explanations you have given, that the universe is to worship Christ with spiritual and divine worship. Notwithstanding this, I presume you profess to believe, that some, if not many in this universe, are to be forever miserable. How to reconcile these things, has been a subject of consideration with me. After turning, and looking at these things on all sides, I am unable to devise, how you can reconcile them to your own mind, but in one or the other of the three following ways. But as each of these ways, present to me some difficulties, I shall state them, hoping that you will assist me, if possible to remove them. But this must be the matter of another communication.

I am yours, respectfully,

W. BALFOUR.

LETTER II.

February 19, 1820.

SIR,—I stated to you in my last communication, that there were only three ways which had occurred to me, by which you could make the everlasting punishment of the wicked, consistent with the quotation I made from your letters. As each of these ways, present difficulties to my mind, I shall proceed to a statement of them, relying on you for some explanation.

1st. It occurred to me, that you might believe the universe, would render spiritual and divine worship to Christ, yet hold the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked, by saying, that, ‘the place of their punishment, was without the bounds of the universe.’ Admitting this to be your view, I admit your statements to be consistent with your belief in the eternal punishment of the wicked. My mind however asks, ‘Is this true?’ Do not you think, that this is a very fanciful idea? If you indeed suppose, that the place where the wicked are to be punished, is without the bounds of the universe, please inform us, in whose dominions this place is? But as I do not believe you capable of entertaining such a foolish idea, I pass this, and notice,

2d. That it further occurred to me, you might

attempt to extricate yourself from the difficulties in which the paragraph quoted involves you, in the following manner. In commenting on the passage quoted from Phillipians, you say, Christ 'is the proper ^{or} object of universal adoration.' Did you mean by this to inform us, that Christ was the proper *object* of universal adoration, but that he was not universally adored? If so, I can easily understand, how you hold to the everlasting punishment of some, but then I am unable to reconcile this with the comments which you have given in the paragraph of your letters on which I am remarking. Remember Sir, you have told us, that, 'things in heaven, earth and under the earth, is a common periphrasis for the universe.' Besides, the texts quoted, and your comments upon them seem to prove, that this very universe, renders spiritual and divine worship to Christ. Should this seem the least doubtful from the text in Phillipians, all doubt seems to be removed by the one you quote from Revelation. Notice its language, Sir, 'And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, blessing and honor, &c.' Observe also your own language in commenting on this passage. Do you speak of Christ being only, 'the proper object of universal adoration, but not universally adored?' No, you say, 'if this be not spiritual worship, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine.' John's language does not, and your

comment on his, does not deny, but as the worship is divine, the universe are the worshippers. On the contrary; have you not said, 'things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers for the universe.' If this indeed be true, and you are confident that the worship rendered by this universe is spiritual and divine, where do you find your subjects for everlasting punishment, unless among spiritual and divine worshippers of Christ? Are any of them to be the subject of this? As I am confident you do not believe any such thing, suffer me to appeal to your candor; if there is not a difficulty, which requires your consideration here, and which I hope you will condescend to resolve. You are a man of too much mind, not to perceive the difficulty, and my opinion of you is, that you are possessed of sufficient humility to say something by way of explanation.

3d. But it occurred to me, that you reconciled the paragraph on which I am remarking, with your belief of endless punishment, by explaining the universal language of Paul and John in the texts in a restricted sense. Presuming, that this is the mode you take of extricating yourself, my desire is to see you do it honorably. The difficulties which have presented themselves to me on this mode of interpretation, will be best presented to you by considering the two passages which you quote, in order.

In Phillip, ii: 10, 11, the word *every* is found

twice : ‘ that at the name of Jesus *every* knee should bow, and that *every* tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.’ Let us then understand the word *every* here, as not meaning all or every individual, but only *some*, and see how it will suit. ‘ That at the name of Jesus *some* knees should bow of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth ; and that *some* tongues should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.’ According to this way of understanding the word *every*, only some knees in heaven bow to Christ, and some tongues confess that he is Lord. But is this true ? Are there any such as bow not to, or confess not Christ in heaven ? This interpretation of the word *every*, however well it might suit, when applied to persons on earth, and under the earth, it will not do when applied to persons in heaven. Are we then in this passage to understand the word, as meaning *all* or *every* individual in heaven, and only *some* on the earth ? This would be understanding the word *every*, in two different senses in the course of one sentence. The word *every* is not repeated, but ought to be understood as repeated, after every thing spoken of in the passage, thus, ‘ that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things on earth, and that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things under the earth.’ And the apostle adds, as including all he had just mentioned, ‘ And that eve-

ry tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' But in this way of understanding the word *every*, the passage must read thus, 'That at the name of Jesus *every* knee should bow, of things in heaven, and that at the name of Jesus *some* knees should bow, of things in earth, and that at the name of Jesus *some* knees should bow of things under the earth.' But, supposing that all this was very good, how are we to dispose of the next part of the sentence in which the word *every* occurs? 'And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, &c.' In what sense are we to understand the word *every*, here? Does it mean *some* or *every* individual? If only *some*, it must refer to, and be restricted by, the things on earth, and under the earth. If it means all or every individual, it is only applicable to the things in heaven. Now, my dear Sir, in which of these senses are we to understand it? If the word *every*, is not to be understood, as meaning every individual uniformly throughout the whole passage, be pleased to refer to some other parallel texts, in which the word *every*, must evidently be understood in two such different senses in the course of one sentence.

But perhaps you may say, 'have I not explained things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, to be a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers for the universe,' collectively taken, and not in this way of separating its parts. Yes, you have, and to this

very thing I wish to call your attention. Let us, then see how it will do to understand the word *every*, as only meaning *some* in the universe. It is a plain case, and stands thus: You make the apostle gravely tell us, 'some in the universe shall bow the knee to Jesus, and some in the universe shall confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father.' Do you think, that this was all the apostle meant to express in the passage? Is this then all the Saviour's reward for his humiliation, sufferings and death, recorded in the preceding verses? Is this indeed all, for which God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that some knees should bow to him in the universe, and some tongues confess that he is Lord. If we thus modify, and explain away the word *every*, it is all the apostle did express, and this is all the reward of Jesus' work. It will not mend the matter much, if instead of the word *some*, we should substitute the word *many*. The difficulty still presses, where it most needs to be relieved. Let us see if it does not. 'That at the name of Jesus, *many* knees should bow of things in heaven,' &c. You may easily perceive, that it still makes the apostle say, that there are in heaven *some* knees which do not bow to Christ, and *some* tongues that do not confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Understanding it, of the universe collectively, it makes the apostle say, that, '*many* knees shall bow to Christ, and *many* tongues in the universe shall confess that

he is Lord to the glory of God the Father ;' but I doubt if this is the full amount of the apostle's meaning. If you think it is, I will thank you to make this clearly appear. The things which lead me to doubt, I shall briefly state that you may accommodate your reply accordingly.

The word *every*, appears to me to apply equally to every thing mentioned in the passage. It seems to me to be an arbitrary mode of interpretation, to make it mean *every* individual in heaven, and only *some* or *many* on earth and under the earth. Besides, I would submit it to your superior judgment, whether the apostle does not in the conclusion of the passage, encourage us to take the most extensive view of what he says in the beginning of it. After saying, 'That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth,' instead of qualifying these general or universal expressions, he adds, 'And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' But further, what bears weight in my mind most, is, the connexion in which the passage stands, and the design of the apostle in introducing it. This is so obvious that I need not point it out. I would only say, it seems most natural to me, that the apostle in shewing the exalted condition of the Saviour, instead of using language which needed to be qualified, would use language which ought to be understood in its most unlimited sense. I may add, and which has some weight with me,

that in the verse preceding the passage under consideration, the apostle uses the word *every*, which I think cannot be doubted, must be understood in its most extensive sense. It runs thus, 'Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above *every* name.' Must we change the word *every* into *some* or *many* immediately, for the apostle adds with the very next breath, 'That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow,' &c. Must not the every knee that shall bow to him, and the every tongue that shall confess that he is Lord, be as extensively understood as the every name he is above?

As I have not the talent of saying much in few words, I must reserve the remainder of my remarks for one more communication.

Yours, respectfully,

W. BALFOUR.

LETTER III.

March 4, 1820.

SIR,—The second text in the paragraph quoted from your letters to Mr. CHANNING, and on which I wish to make my remarks, is Rev. v: 8—14. To this text and your comments on it

I shall now turn your attention. Having quoted at length the above passage in my first letter, I shall here only transcribe verse 13th: 'And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.' Let it not be forgotten, Sir, that you have told us in the paragraph quoted from your letters in my first communication, that 'things i. e. beings in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis for the universe.' It cannot come within the range of fair debate, that the same periphrasis is expressed in this verse as in Phillipians ii: 10, the passage on which you give us this comment. If there be any difference it is, that in this verse the periphrasis is expressed more fully. Nor is any room left for us to debate whether the worship mentioned in this passage be spiritual and divine. You express yourself clearly and decidedly about this. You say, 'If this be not spiritual worship, and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case, where worship can be called spiritual and divine.' The point then to be examined is, how are we to understand the words *every* and *all* which occur in this passage. Understanding these words in a universal sense, you prove, that every being in the universe shall worship Christ with spiritual and divine worship. What could a Universalist wish you to prove more? But as

you profess your belief in the eternal punishment of many, you must modify or explain the words *every* and *all* to mean only *some*. Let us examine this matter and see how these words ought to be understood.

I think it will be frankly conceded, that if any difficulties pressed in limiting the word *every* in the former passage, the same difficulties press in limiting the words *every* and *all*, here. Let us see how limiting these words to *some*, would suit in this passage. ‘And *some* creatures which are in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and *some* that are in them heard I saying, &c.’ Are we then to understand that some only in heaven are to worship Jesus? But, I presume here, as in the former passage, you would give the word *every* its most extensive sense as it respects creatures in heaven, but its limited sense as it respects those on earth and under the earth. Having remarked on this arbitrary mode of interpretation already, I pass this over. It ought not to escape observation, that there seems to be something said in this text, which forbids this mode of interpreting the words *every* and *all*. It is this. After John says, ‘And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea,’ observe, Sir, he adds, ‘*And all that are in them.*’ John does not say, ‘and all that are in *it*,’ referring to heaven; no, but he says, ‘and all that are in *them*,’ referring to all the places he had mentioned, heaven, earth, under

the earth, and in the sea. Does this look like limiting the word every? Or understanding both in a limited and universal sense the word every in the very same sentence? This phrase, 'and all that are in them,' instead of modifying the word every, seems to express with the more certainty the universal sense in which it ought to be understood. John, instead of qualifying what he had just said, rather adds something to strengthen and confirm it.

But understanding the words *every* and *all*, as only meaning some, let us see what follows? It makes John inform us twice in the compass of one sentence that some beings in the universe worship Christ. Does John then use all this glowing language, for no other purpose but to tell us twice, that some persons in the universe are to worship him? After specifying all parts of the universe, after telling us every creature in them, yea after adding, 'and all that are in them,' are we only to understand, that some in heaven, earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, shall render to him spiritual and divine worship? It may be so, but your candor will certainly allow, that John's language seems to convey somewhat of a different idea. In your comments on this passage, you say nothing to shew, that the words every and all, ought to be restricted to some in the universe. Your object in quoting it did not lead you to say any thing about this. You quoted it to prove that spiritual and divine worship was rendered to Christ. But can we learn from the

text with more certainty, that Christ is worshipped at all, than we can from your comments, that the universe are the worshippers? Is it more certain from the text and your comment, that the worship is spiritual and divine, than that every creature in heaven, on earth, under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them perform it? May I not then return you your own comment on this passage, with the following addition to it: ‘If this be not spiritual worship and if Christ be not the object of it here; *and also every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them perform it,* I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine, *and where the universe are said to be the worshippers.*’ The words marked, you will easily perceive contain my addition. I leave you to judge, if it be not a very necessary addition to your comment, and is equally supported by the passage. By what process of reasoning, and by what laws of interpretation can it be made fairly out from this passage, that every creature in heaven worships Christ, which is only one part of the universe, and that on earth, under the earth, and in the sea, the other three parts of the same universe; only *some* worship him. You are bound to explain why you limit the words *every* and *all* applied to three parts of this universe, and give them in the very same passage an unlimited signification when applied to one part of it.

I am aware, that it may be said by you and others—‘Are there not many passages of scripture, which speak of everlasting punishment to the wicked, and what are these two, which seem to speak of universal salvation when laid in the balance with them?’ I frankly admit this, but must say, there must be some way in which these opposite texts can be fairly reconciled. About nothing am I more certain than this, that one writer of scripture never contradicts another, or himself, when we truly understand them. In your letters to Mr. Channing, you have told us, that we are not to adopt rules of interpretation for the purpose of saving the consistency of the inspired writers; that if by the fair rules of exegesis apparent contradictions cannot be reconciled, the credit of the writer must go down. Suffer me also to remind you, that you have also asserted in your letters that the truth of any doctrine, does not depend on the number of passages in which it is taught. That a law once promulged, is not rendered more true by its being many times repeated. Admitting all this, and I do not see how it can be controverted, let us simply apply it to the case before us. If universal salvation be taught in the two passages on which I have been remarking, it is as true as if it had been taught in a thousand. If there be indeed a palpable contradiction between these, and other texts, which speak of everlasting punishment to the wicked, there is no way left but to give up the credit of one or other of the writers. Per-

suaded as I am, that this contradiction has its origin, not in the inspired writers, but in my ignorance of the scriptures, I use all means to be better informed of their contents. On this account I have taken the liberty to address you for information, how you reconcile the paragraph quoted from your letters, with your belief in the endless punishment of any being in the universe of God. Certain I am, that you are in the possession of knowledge I have not, consistently to reconcile these two things—‘That the universe shall worship Christ with spiritual and divine worship, yet many of the beings in this universe be eternally miserable.’ If you are in possession of such information, be kind enough to communicate it, and be assured, that it will meet with profound attention from

Yours, respectfully,

W. BALFOUR.

[It will be perceived by the reader from what follows, that I waited four months, expecting Mr. Stuart to make some reply to the preceding letters. Doubting whether the editor of the Magazine had sent Mr. Stuart the numbers in which they appeared, and after ascertaining that he had sent them; on the fourth of July 1820, I wrote him a letter by mail. No notice being taken of it, and after waiting to December 28th, I sent the following note to the editor of the Magazine, inclosing a copy of this letter for publication. Both these now follow, and will sufficiently account for

the time which elapsed between the three first letters and those which followed.]

LETTER IV.

DECEMBER 28, 1820.

To the Editor of the Universalist Magazine,

REV. SIR,—Sometime ago I requested the information, if you had sent the Nos. of the Magazine in which my letters to Professor STUART appeared. You were kind enough to inform me that they had been sent him. After receiving this information I transmitted by mail the following letter to him, of which I now send you the copy for publication.

JULY 4, 1820.

REV. MOSES STUART,

SIR,—Sometime ago I addressed several letters to you through the medium of the 'Universalist Magazine.' I requested the Nos. to be sent you in which these letters appeared. No reply being made I began to doubt whether my request had been complied with. To satisfy myself I made the inquiry, and in the Magazine of July 1st, the Editor informs me that the Nos. in which the above letters appeared were certainly sent you. I may therefore conclude that you

have seen these letters, though you have not thought fit to say any thing to relieve my mind from the difficulties which your book to Mr. Channing occasioned.

It is probable, upon reading my letters, that you concluded they were written by a Universalist, and were intended to draw you into controversy with them. I assure you that this was not the case. I never knew what it was to be shaken in my faith on this subject until I read your book. The paragraph on which I took the liberty to remark, struck me with all the force I mentioned. My letters were written in the uprightness and integrity of my heart, and with an unfeigned desire that you would, if possible, relieve my mind from the perplexity which you had occasioned. It is true that my letters have the shape in some places, of one not writing to have doubts removed, but rather of one writing to defend sentiments most surely believed. This was done with the express design, that your reply might be shaped not merely to suit me but to convince the Universalists. If they be in an error, some means ought to be used to convince them of it, and no man seems more capable of doing it than yourself, and doing it in the spirit of meekness.

My design in the present communication, is to beg it as a favor, that you would say something to relieve the difficulties of my mind which I stated in my letters. As your book has been the means of creating them, I wish from my heart that you may be the means of removing them. But as

the paragraph on which I remarked confirms the faith of Universalists, if you deem them to be in error, the interest of truth demands from you some explanation. For my sake, for their sake, and above all, for the sake of the truth, I hope you will condescend to do this. I tremble to embrace error of any kind. If my heart does not greatly deceive me, I sincerely desire to know and obey whatever God has revealed in the scriptures. Had I been the means of shaking your faith on any subject as you have done mine, I would render you every assistance in my power. This assistance I earnestly request of you. I am fully aware that from your professional and other duties you cannot spare time to write largely on this subject. I make no such demand. All I wish you to do is, in a brief way to afford me a clue, whereby I may be led out of the difficulties which I have stated in my letters. I simply wish you to state, by what fair rule of interpretation I can understand the scriptures and your comments on them differently, which occasioned my remarks.

Since I finished my letters to you I have been examining the places in which (*ta panta*) occur which you say means the universe. It will be an additional favor conferred on me, if you could so shape your answer as to relieve similar difficulties arising from the following texts in which *ta panta* are found: 1 Cor. xv: 24—29; Col. i: 16—21; Heb. ii: 6—10; Eph. i: 10; Phillip iii: 21, &c. &c.

Any reply to my letters which you may be pleased to make, I presume will be admitted into the Universalist Magazine, the editor of which, instead of avoiding rather invites discussion. My only reason for not giving my name is, it would be foolish to afford people occasion of saying I had embraced the doctrine of Universal Salvation, when I am only using every proper means to avoid it. There is no danger of my doing so if you can state evidence that the views advanced in your letters are consistent with the opposite doctrine. If you cannot do this how can we avoid being Universalists?

I have only to add, that I esteem your talents and character, and sincerely hope my esteem will be increased by your gratifying my wishes in this communication.

I am yours as formerly, &c.

Such Sir, is a true copy of the letter sent to Mr. Stuart. If he ever sent you any communication relative to the above, I know it not. Certainly I have never observed any thing in your Magazine of this nature, though a constant reader of it. I have certainly waited a reasonable time for his reply, but as none is given I shall now state my reasons for sending you the above for publication.

First of all then, I am not ashamed to say, that I am inquiring after truth. Since I have finished my letters to Mr. Stuart I have given his letters another reading, which has led to a few more letters to him which I shall send you for publication. Before doing this I wish it to be seen, that I have used every proper means to induce Mr. Stuart to some explanation. Should he still decline

this, I most sincerely request any other person to do this for him, and prevent me from error if I am wrong. If my former letters and those I intend sending to you, can be fairly answered, I shall esteem the man who does this my best friend. Be pleased therefore to publish this, and send the Nos. of the Magazine in which my letters may appear to Mr. Stuart. I pledge myself to send you with the last letter what will cover the expense.

I am Sir, yours respectfully, &c.

W. BALFOUR.

LETTER V.

February 3, 1821.

DEAR SIR,—It is with great reluctance, that I again address you. I fondly hoped, that you would have answered my former letters, and removed my difficulties. This you have not condescended to do. Since I finished these letters I have thought considerable on the subject of them. I have also given your letters a second perusal, but instead of my difficulties being diminished, they have increased. Permit me in as brief a way as possible to state these, still hoping that you or some one else, will condescend satisfactorily to remove them.

In my former letters it was noticed that you

explained 'ta panta,' to signify the universe. Perusing your letters a second time, I find, that you repeatedly assert this. In page 67th, you say, 'But what are the all things, the universe (ta panta), which the Logos made or created? Ta panta then which the Logos created means (as common usage and the exigency of the passage require) the universe; the worlds material and immaterial.' Also, addressing Mr. Channing particularly, page 116, you add—'Are you not bound to tell us how this Logos (word) could *create* the worlds *ta panta the universe*.' In some other places, you make similar statements, which I forbear quoting. It occurred to me after reading these statements, that it might be useful to consult the places where the phrase ta panta is used by the sacred writers. This I have done, and shall now submit for your consideration the result of my investigations.

The first passage then which I quote is Col. ii: 15—17. It thus stands; 'Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; for by him were all things (ta panta the universe) created that are in heaven, and that are on earth, visible or invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things (ta panta the universe) were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things (panton) and by him all things (ta panta the universe) consist. And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things (pa-

son) he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all (pan) fullness dwell ; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things (ta panta the universe) unto himself ; by him I say, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven.' It will easily be perceived by you, that my reason for inserting the Greek, is to show, that the apostle uses (ta panta the universe) about other things than Christ's being its creator. Ta panta which you affirm means the universe, occurs no less than four times in this passage, and also several times equivalent to ta panta. This I am confident you will not dispute. May I then be permitted to ask you, Is it more plainly and certainly said by the apostle, that by Christ 'were all things (ta panta the universe) created,' than it is said by him, 'that it pleased the Father by him to reconcile all things (ta panta the universe) unto himself?' I make my appeal to your candor, if we have not the same evidence, that God is to reconcile the universe to himself by Jesus Christ, as, that he created it by him. The very same phrase (ta panta) is used by the apostle about both. So far as I am able to judge, I think we have some additional evidences in favor of God's reconciling the universe to himself. Observe, Sir, what is said. The apostle after saying, 'it pleased the Father by him to reconcile all things unto himself,' he adds, 'by him I say, whether they be things on earth-or things in heaven.' Need I remind you

that in commenting on Phillip, ii: 10, 11, you inform us that 'things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis for the universe (*ta pan* or *ta panta*).' Here then the apostle uses both. He not only says it pleased the Father by Christ to reconcile all things (*ta panta*) the universe unto himself; but to make it the more certain he adds the common periphrasis, 'by him I say, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven.' But this very passage you quote in page 72d of your letters, and thus comment on it. After finding fault with the views of some commentators, you say, 'By reconciling things in heaven and things on earth seems evidently to be meant bringing into union, under one great head, i. e. Christ; by a new and special bond of intercommunication, both angels and men. In like manner the two great parties on earth, Jews and Gentiles are united together. But why Christ should be called 'the image of the invisible God' and the head (*prototokos*) of all creation' because he is merely the instrument of bringing Jews and Gentiles together, is not apparent to me.' Such Sir, is your comment, and for it I presume you will receive the thanks of every Universalist. Verily they may say, 'Surely Mr. Stuart is not far from the kingdom of God.' If then your explanation of *ta panta* be just, if your comment be correct, yea, if the apostle's words be not greatly misunderstood, all go to prove, that God is to reconcile the universe to himself by Jesus Christ; or according to you,

angels and men, Jews and Gentiles, are to be brought into union under one head, Christ, by a new and special bond of intercommunication.

Whilst engaged in examining the texts in which the phrase *ta panta* is found, I accidentally had my attention turned to the following passage in Dr. Campbell's dissertations. He says, Dissert. 6. part 2, sec. 6: 'In further evidence of this doctrine, the inhabitants of *hades* are, from their subterranean abode, denominated in the New Testament, Phillip, ii: 10, *katahthonioi*, a word of the same import with the phrase *hupokato tes ges*, *under the earth* in the apocalypse chap. v: 13, and which, with the *epouranioi* and *epigeioi*, *celestial* and *terrestrial* beings, include the whole rational creation.' The two texts here referred to by the Dr. were those to which I called your attention in my former letters. Not then having seen this in his dissertations, permit me here to notice some things in the above quotation, which bear on the subject before us. Be pleased then, to notice, that *katahthonioi* in Phillip, ii: 10, and the phrase *hupokato tes ges* in Rev. v: 13, are of the same or similar import. It is certain, that our translators have translated both by the same phrase, *under the earth*. Notice further, those persons or beings 'under the earth,' together with *epouranioi*, and *epigeioi*, or *celestial* and *terrestrial* beings, include the whole rational creation; or as it is in our translation, Phillip. ii: 10, 'things in heaven and things on earth.' Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, you say, is a com-

mon periphrasis for the universe. Should we then Sir, be able to find in scripture, that all the beings in all these places, or according to Dr. Campbell, 'the whole rational creation,' or according to you 'the universe,' are reconciled or subdued to God, is it not a settled point, that universal salvation must be the doctrine of scripture? What more pray remains to be reconciled or subdued to God than the universe, the worlds material and immaterial, or the whole rational creation? That something in scripture very like this is to be found, has been shewn in my former letters, from Phillip. ii : 10, 11, and Rev. v : 13. Your own concessions and explanations of these two texts, and the one under consideration, would lead one to think, that you believed universal salvation to be a scripture doctrine. Certainly nothing that I have ever seen from the pen of a Universalist, is half so convincing to me, as what you and Dr. Campbell have conceded or said on this subject. Let us examine this.

Dr. Campbell in the above extract asserts that, 'the inhabitants of *hades*, are from their subterranean abode denominated in the New Testament Phillip. ii : 10, *katahthonioi*, a word of the same import with the phrase *hupokato tes ges under the earth* in the apocalypse chap. v : 13.' By *hades*, you know the Dr. does not mean the place called *hell*, but the invisible world or state of the dead. The beings therefore referred to by these two Greek expressions, and translated in our version *under the earth*, include all the dead, good

or bad in the invisible state, or in hades. But the Dr. further asserts, that those beings *under the earth*, or in hades, with the *epouranioi* and *epegeioi*, *celestial* and *terrestrial* beings, include the whole rational creation.' Keeping these statements of the Dr. in view, suffer me to recur again to Phillip. ii: 10. It is there said, 'That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, (*epouranion*) and things in earth, (*epigeion*) and things under the earth, (*katahthonion*.) Now, my dear Sir, here are three words, which the Dr. says include the whole rational creation. Here is *katahthonioi*, beings under the earth, *epouranion* and *epigeion*, celestial and terrestrial beings, which include the whole rational creation; or according to your explanation, is the common periphrasis for the universe. Now, the passage says, 'that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow in all these places, or every knee in the universe or whole rational creation, should bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. I need not remind you, that you contend, that this bowing the knee at the name of Jesus, is spiritual worship. What Sir, can be more clear from these statements of your's and Dr. Campbell's than that the whole rational creation, are to render spiritual and divine worship to Christ.

The above text, is the only one in the New Testament, in which I can find the word *katahthonioi* used. The phrase *hupokato tes ges*, of the same import with it, I find only in the two

following passages. The first is Rev. v: 13, the passage which the Dr. refers to above, and which is the text I called your attention to in my former letters. The other is verse 3, of the same chapter, in which this phrase occurs, and which proves that what you and the Dr. have asserted, is correct. It reads thus, ‘And no man in heaven, (*ourano*,) nor in earth, (*epi tes ges*,) was able to open the book, neither to look therein.’ Is not the meaning here simply this. No man in the universe, or in the whole rational creation, was able to open the book, the very explanation which the Dr. and you have given. Now Sir, compare verse 13th in the Greek with this verse, or let any one compare them in our English version, and see the similarity of the language used. If the meaning in verse 3 be the universe or whole rational creation, this must also be the meaning of verse 13.

I have noticed above, that by *hades* is not meant *hell*, according to the usual acceptation of this word, but the invisible state of the dead, including all good or bad. No one can doubt this, who reads Dr. Campbell’s dissertation referred to above. I would therefore simply suggest it for consideration, without deciding, whether in the following text, we have not another mode of expression for the universe or the whole rational creation. Thus Rom. xiv: 9, it is said, ‘For to this end Christ both died, and rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.’ By the dead all in *hades* may be included,

and by the living all the rest of the rational creation. Christ is said to be Lord both of the dead and living, and corresponds with the same, as 'Lord of all.' Acts x: 36.

But let us return from this digression, if it may be called one, to the passage under consideration. Should it be said, that in this passage neither the word *katahthonioi* nor the phrase *hupokato tes ges* are used. True, but you cannot deny, that *ta panta* occurs four times, and according to your own explanation it means the universe which includes the whole. If it therefore hath pleased the Father, by Jesus Christ to reconcile (*ta panta*) the universe to himself, surely these words which express only a part of this universe must be included. But if neither of these expressions are used in this passage, the apostle has not only used *ta panta* the universe, but the expressions '*things in heaven and things in earth*,' which you aver is a common periphrasis for the universe.

Looking back on the remarks made, may I not ask as you do Mr. Channing, only altering the language to suit the subject,—'But what are the all things, the universe *ta panta* which the Father by Christ is to reconcile to himself? *Ta panta* then which the Father reconciles to himself, means, [as common usage and the exigency of the passage require], the universe; the 'worlds material and immaterial,' or as Dr. Campbell says, 'the whole rational creation.' Can you prove, that common usage, and the exigency of

this passage, require us to understand *ta panta* the universe, when Christ is said to create it, but that it means something very different, when by him it is reconciled. I think if common usage is resorted to, you will find, that *ta panta* is oftener used when the subjection or reconciliation of the universe is spoken of, than when he is said to be the creator of it. Before I have done, you shall see this remark sufficiently established. But suffer me to ask, does the exigency of this passage require us to understand *ta panta* differently from what I have done? By what law of exegesis must we understand it to mean the universe, verse 16th, and not understand it in a similar sense in verse 20th? Must it mean the universe without limitation when God by Christ created it, and are we to understand it in a very limited sense when God by him reconciles it? But I am happy to see, that in your comments on this text quoted above, you neither say nor insinuate any such thing. May I not then put the question, which you put to Mr. Channing, with a variation of the language suited to the subject. 'Are you not bound to tell us how God by Christ reconciles the universe to himself, and notwithstanding this, profess that all the universe will not be saved?'

Before I dismiss this passage, there are one or two remarks more I must be permitted to make. The apostle after stating to us in verse 20th God's reconciling the universe to himself, adds in verse 21st, 'And you that were sometime alien-

ated and enemies in your minds by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled.' Notice the expression Sir, *yet now hath he reconciled*. The apostle by this expression intimates, that the Colossians to whom he wrote, were at that present time a specimen or a beginning of the reconciliation of the universe, which he had spoken of in the preceding verses. This seems to agree with what is said of the Jews, Rom. xi : 5, 'Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace,' but adds verse 26th, 'And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.' Besides, you know that the first fruits under the law were not only a specimen of, but a pledge of the gathering in of the full harvest. Referring to this, James says, chap. i : 18, 'Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures.'

To conclude this communication I would observe, that it is vain for us to pretend, that in the above remarks there is no force. I aver, that no man capable of reading them and of putting two ideas together, can help feeling their force. I have freely expressed the force they have on my mind, and I call upon you to shew me my error if you are able, by reconciling these statements with the idea of limited salvation. Until you, or some one else shall do this, I should sinfully abuse the faculties God has given me, and

lie with my lips to deny, that, this passage has at least the appearance of proving, that it pleased the Father by Jesus Christ to reconcile the universe, or whole rational creation to himself. If I am really mistaken, one thing is certain, Dr, Campbell and yourself, have been the instruments of leading me into it, by your becoming hewers of wood and drawers of water to the Universalists. It will not be pretended that I have misunderstood or misrepresented either of you. I have only shown, that the statements you have made, fairly involve the doctrine of the salvation of the universe, or whole rational creation. If you can shew their consistency with the contrary doctrine, no man in the universe will be more obliged than yours,

W. BALFOUR.

LETTER VI.

DEAR SIR,—The next passage to which I solicit your attention and in which *ta panta* is found, is 1 Cor. xv : 24—29 : ‘Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father ; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For

he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things (*ta panta the universe*) under him. And when all things (*ta panta the universe*) shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that did put all things (*ta panta the universe*) under him, that God may be all in all.' This passage demands particular attention. I hope I shall be excused in being somewhat minute in my examination of it.

Let it then be observed, Sir, that '*ta panta*,' which you say means '*the universe*,' occurs three times. To you it is superfluous to add, that, it also occurs several times in a form equivalent to *ta panta*. Let us go over in order the things mentioned in this passage.

It is said, 'Then cometh the end.' The question naturally occurs here,—The end of what? I presume it is generally allowed to be the end of Christ's reign. If the question is asked,—His reign over what? The answer from the passage plainly is, his reign over the kingdom which he is to deliver up to God, even the Father. But let us ask again,—When shall the end come? The passage answers: 'When he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father.' But let us ask again,—What is to be accomplished by Christ before this end comes? The pas-

sage answers : The kingdom shall not be delivered up, and the end come, until ' he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, for he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.' And of these enemies the last to be destroyed ' is death.' But the apostle proceeds, ' for he hath put all things under his feet.' It is necessary to notice here what the same apostle says, Heb. ii : 8, 9, ' But *now* we see not *yet* all things (*ta panta*) *the universe* put under him ; but we see Jesus who was made a little lower (for a little time lower) than the angels, crowned with glory and honor,' &c. Compare Phillip. ii : 9, 10, 11. It is true even in our day, that we see not yet all things put under Christ, that is, actually subdued to him, yet we know that he is exalted for this purpose, and the apostle assures us, that—' he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.' *Ta panta, the universe* was put under him by the Father to be subdued, and when this is fully accomplished, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.' But there are some things in the passage which demand a distinct and more enlarged consideration.

1st. The extent of the subjection to Christ mentioned in it. This point appears to be settled by yourself. You expressly and repeatedly inform us, that *ta panta* which occurs three times, means *the universe*. Now, dear Sir, can words more emphatically declare than is done in this

passage, that the universe shall be subdued to Christ? Could you have produced such a plain and emphatic passage to prove Christ the creator of the universe, what would you say of the man who would resist such evidence? Is there a single text produced by you so plain as this is, that Christ created the universe? Will you then say that *ta panta* means the whole universe when Christ is said to create it, but that it means only a part of the universe when he is said to subdue it? If *ta panta* does not mean a part but the whole of the universe when Christ is said to be its creator, by what fair rule of interpretation can you shew, that it does mean only a part of this universe when he is said to be its subduer? If once this arbitrary mode of explaining the language of scripture is admitted, what is it we may not prove from the bible? But my dear Sir, I impute no such thing to you, I simply request you to state how you deliver yourself out of the above difficulty. So long as you maintain, that, *ta panta* means the whole universe when Christ is said to create it, so long you must expect the Universalists to maintain, that it means the whole universe when he is said to subdue it. But if I am not greatly mistaken, we are not left to decide this point by the mere use of the phrase *ta panta* in this passage. The extent of the subjection to Christ, of which this passage speaks, is decided in it by a way which leaves little room for debate. You know, when exceptions are made to a general subject, all not excepted are allowed to be

included. Observe then, that there is one, and only one exception made by the apostle in the passage about *ta panta the universe*, being subdued to Christ. This is God himself. He says, 'But when he saith, all things (*ta panta the universe*) are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him.' Can you prove that there are other exceptions? Can you refer us to other texts in which some more exceptions are made? Be pleased to say in what other part of the bible they are to be found. But as if even this was not enough, the apostle says, that Christ is, to 'put down all rule and all authority and power.' Yea, that 'he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet;' and that 'the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' Besides, to shew the ultimate and complete nature of this subjection, the apostle says, 'And when all things (*ta panta the universe*) shall be subdued unto him, then shall the son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.' Will you be kind enough to shew, what, after all this is done, yet remains in the universe to be subdued? How shall all things or the universe be subdued unto Christ, and yet a great part of it still remain in rebellion? And how shall God be all in all if this be the truth? How is it, that the last enemy which is to be destroyed is death, and yet millions of the human race are to remain forever under the power of the second death? Do, my dear Sir, explain how the

universe is to be subdued and put under Christ's feet, and yet by many it is believed, that the greater half of the children of men are to remain in rebellion and misery to the endless ages of eternity? I am aware, Sir, that what I have said about the extent of this subjection may perhaps be admitted, yet you may dispute with the Universalists about the kind. I shall therefore,

2d. Attempt a consideration of the nature of the subjection mentioned in the passage. The important question at issue here is, are we to understand this subjection a *forced* or *willing* subjection? Is it constrained by force or fear, or is it the effect of love? Does it consist in the universe being subdued, yet rebels still at heart, or does it consist in all being made loving and obedient subjects? I have used some pains to examine this point with care and impartiality, and shall lay before you the result of my investigations.

1st. Then, I attempted to understand the subjection mentioned, a constrained subjection, but could find nothing in the meaning of the original word, or circumstances mentioned, nor in the scope of the writer to support this view. If any thing of this nature is contained in the passage it has escaped my observation. 2d. I next attempted to understand the subjection, as partly constrained and partly of love, knowing that Christ is at least to have some loving and obedient subjects. I found this view would not suit any better than the former. I could find nothing to justify it, but

much to condemn it as shall presently appear. The subjection I saw, must be understood either as universally constrained, or universally of love. To support the latter of these views, the following things have occurred to me. 1st. It is the subjection of (*ta panta*) *the universe*, and this subjection is spoken of throughout the whole passage as of the same nature or kind. It is the universe which is to be subdued, and no distinction is made about different kinds of subjection. No hint is given that some shall be subdued by force, and others be subdued by love. The universe is put under Christ to be subdued, and all are spoken of as partakers of the same kind of subjection. If the subjection is constrained, it must be so to all, and if we understand it of love, it must be so to all. That this subjection is a willing subjection, or of love, may be inferred, 2d. From the same original word expressing the subjection of the universe to Christ, and Christ's subjection to the Father. No man for a moment hesitates to admit, when it is said, 'then shall the Son also be subject unto him that put all things under him,' that this subjection is voluntary and of love. For what good reason then ought we to understand it otherwise, when the very same word expresses the subjection of the universe to Christ? Consistency and candor require, that we understand the subjection in both either to be constrained, or in both voluntary, for the apostle considered the same word a correct expression for both. But this seems to be confirmed by at-

tending, 3d. To the meaning and scripture usage of the original word. As to its meaning, Parkhurst says, it signifies 'to set or place under, to subject, subdue.—1 Cor. xv. 27. Ephes. i. 22. Phillip. iii. 21. Heb. ii. 5–8. *Upotassomai* passive or middle, with a dative following to be subject or in subjection to. The word, says Leigh, in Rom. xiii. 1, signifieth an orderly subjection, and Wetstein on Luke ii. 51, shews that the Greek writers sometimes apply it to a voluntary submission.'

As to scripture usage of the word, after examining all the places where it is found, the fact is, in few or none of the places where it occurs, can it be supposed that a constrained subjection is meant. The following are all the places in which *upotasso* and the derivative *upotage* are found. I shall in the briefest manner notice them. The word then is used to express the subjection of Christ to the Father.—1 Cor. xv. 28. The subjection of (*ta panta*) the universe to Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 24–27. Heb. ii. 8. Philip. iii. 21. 1 Peter iii. 22; to the want of subjection in the carnal mind to God's law, Rom. viii. 7. and to God's righteousness, Rom. x. 3. It is used to express the subjection of christians in various ways. Their subjection to God, James iv. 7; to Christ, Eph. v. 24; to his gospel, 2 Cor. ix. 13; to civil rulers, Rom. xiii. 1–5; Titus iii. 1; 1 Peter ii. 13; the subjection of wives to their husbands, 1 Peter iii. 1–6; Col. iii. 18; Eph. v. 22; Titus ii. 5; 1 Cor. xiv. 34; Eph. v. 24; 1 Tim.

ii. 11 ; the subjection of children to their parents, Heb. xii. 9 ; 1 Tim. iii. 4 ; Luke ii. 51 ; of youth to the aged, 1 Peter v. 5 ; of servants to their masters, 1 Peter ii. 18 ; christians are exhorted to submit themselves to such as are eminent in the church for benevolence and labors, 1 Cor. xvi. 16 ; yea all of them are exhorted to be subject one to another, Eph. v. 21 ; 1 Peter v. 5. The apostle did not give place by subjection for an hour to false brethren, Gal. ii. 5. He denies that the world to come, or age, was put in subjection to angels. Heb. ii. 5 ; and says that the spirits of the prophets were subject to the prophets, 1 Cor. xiv. 32. Now, my dear Sir, let any one turn to all these texts, and upon examination he will find, that the usage of this word is not a constrained but a willing subjection. The two following, and the only remaining texts in which this word is found, are all in which I should think any one could find any thing like an exception to the above statement. In Rom. viii. 20, it is said, 'the creature was made subject to vanity not willingly.' As I think you will not deem this an exception, I pass it with a slight remark. Let any one produce a text like this, saying, 'The universe was made subject to Christ, not willingly but by reason of him who hath subjected it,' and I bow before it with reverence. The only other text is Luke x. 17, 20, 'even the devils are subject unto us through thy name,' and 'Rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you.' Admitting that the subjection of the demons here

mentioned, was constrained, yet what is this one instance in opposition to all the above texts to the contrary, in settling the scripture usage of this word. By whomsoever this might be urged, it could not consistently be done by you, for you have said that the worship mentioned in Phillip. ii. 9, 10, and Rev. v. 13, is spiritual and divine, and as we have seen the universe are the worshippers. Surely you never meant that this spiritual and divine worship which the universe is to render to Christ was constrained.

That this subjection to Christ, is a cordial willing subjection, I think may fairly be inferred from your own statements. I refer you to the parts of your letters on which I remarked in my former letters, and in the preceding letter. I now introduce as additional evidence of this, the following passage from your letters, which though it has been noticed before ought to be more particularly brought into view. In your comments on Col. i. 10-17, you thus write ; ‘ Because in verse 20th, Christ is said to reconcile (*katallaxai*) all things unto himself,’ and these are said to be ‘ things in heaven and things on earth ;’ and afterwards, he is represented as breaking down the wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles ; some ingenious commentators have supposed, that ‘ things in heaven and things on earth,’ mean *Jews and Gentiles*. How very unnatural this explanation is no one can help feeling, who reads the passage in an unbiassed manner. In what tolerable sense, can the Jews and Gentiles be

called things visible and invisible? Or how shall we explain the phrase, 'things in heaven and things on earth,' as applied to them? By 'reconciling things in heaven and things on earth,' seems evidently to be meant, bringing into union, under one great head, i. e. Christ, by a new and special bond of intercommunication, both angels and men. In like manner, the two great parties on earth, Jews and Gentiles, are united together. But why Christ should be called, 'the image of the invisible God,' and the 'head (*prototokos*) of all creation,' because he is merely the instrument of bringing Jews and Gentiles together, is not apparent to me.' In addition to the remarks made on a part of this passage, quoted in the preceding letter, I shall only subjoin a remark or two here, shewing, that this paragraph goes to prove, that the subjection mentioned in the passage under consideration, is a voluntary and cordial submission. Let it then be observed, what I think will not be disputed, that the word reconcile in Col. i. and the word subdue in 1 Cor. xv. refer to, and for substance express the same thing accomplished by Christ. In the first he is said to 'reconcile (*katallaxai*) all things (*ta panta*) the universe unto himself.' In the other to 'subdue all things (*ta panta*) the universe to himself.' If then according to your own statement the universe is reconciled and subdued, is not the reconciliation voluntary? Is it possible to conceive how 'angels and men, Jews and Gentiles, are all brought into union under

one great head i. e. Christ, by a new and special bond of inter-communication,' and yet many of them never cordially submit to him? Are multitudes of men in this universe, notwithstanding their being reconciled and subdued to Christ to continue forever rebels? And, although you contend, that the worship which this very universe is to pay him is spiritual and divine, are they to perform it with rebellious hearts after they have been reconciled and subdued? I would gladly change my place of tuition for that of Andover, if I could learn, that these things are either rational or scriptural.

Any additional remarks, which I have to make on the nature of this subjection to Christ, shall be introduced in some passages yet to be considered. I shall, before dismissing this text, spend a few words in attempting

3dly. To ascertain as far as possible the time when this subjection to Christ shall be finally accomplished. The apostle not only speaks of it as certain, but he seems to me to hint in this and in some other places at the time of its final accomplishment. In Heb. ii. 8, the apostle says, 'We see not yet all things put under him.' No, nor do we in our day see this, but this is no proof that it shall never be accomplished. This subjection to Jesus was going on in the apostles' day. It is going on in ours, and will continue to do so until the period in the passage called 'the end.' In the passage, the apostle seems to me, to intimate, that before the end, this shall be finally and

fully accomplished. Instead of any remarks of my own, I prefer quoting the following from Mr. Pierce. He says, commenting on Heb. ii. 8; ‘It will perhaps, be here objected, that all things were put under Jesus at the resurrection, Matt. xxviii. Eph. i. 21. Phillip. ii., how then could this author say that we *see not yet all things put under Jesus*. The answer to this objection is not difficult. At our Saviour’s resurrection all things were given into his hands, and he was invested with a right to, and dominion over them all; but the actual subduing them, and the bringing them into subjection under him, was to be a work of time, not to be completely finished till the conclusion of his reign, and just before his delivering up the kingdom to God even the Father; as is manifest by comparing other places of scripture, where the same thing is spoken of. So when God raised him, and set him at his own right hand, he said to him, Psalm cx. 1, ‘Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.’ And therefore he must reign till God hath put all things under his feet, 1 Cor, xv. 25. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the son also be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all, 1 Cor. xv. 28, compare Dan. ii. 35, 44, 45.’

Submitting the above remarks on this passage for your consideration, I am, dear Sir, your’s &c.

W. BALFOUR.

LETTER VII.

March 24, 1821.

SIR,—The next passage to which I shall call your attention is, Heb. ii, 8.—‘Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all (*ta panta the universe*) in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things (*ta panta the universe*) put under him.’ You will readily perceive, that *ta panta*, which you explain to mean the universe, occurs at least twice in this text. On it I submit the following brief remarks.

1st. This passage proves, that your explanation of *ta panta* is correct. This is evident from comparing verse 7th with it. The all things, or (*ta panta*) *the universe*, verse 8th, is thus explained in the 7th: ‘Thou didst set him over the works of thy hands.’ It could be easily shown, that by ‘the works of thy hands,’ is meant the universe. The 8th Psalm, and page 69th of your letters, afford sufficient evidence of this, which I forbear quoting.

2d. Observe that the passage expressly affirms, that God hath put this *ta panta* or *universe* under Christ’s feet. Not only so, but the apostle declares, that ‘he left nothing that is not put under him.’ The only exception to this subjection is,

that of God himself mentioned 1 Cor. xv. 27, 'it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him.' If this does not prove the universal and complete subjection of the universe to Christ, how is it possible ever to use words so as fully to express it. Supposing God had left you at liberty to choose out words to express the universal and complete subjection of the universe to Christ, pray what language could you have selected more definite or appropriate? In what more guarded language could it have been expressed?

3d. Though the universe is put in subjection to Jesus, it is not yet fully and actually subdued, for the apostle says, 'but now we see not yet all things put under him.' Though the apostle did not see this in his day, nor do we see it even in our day, yet his language strongly implies the certainty of its accomplishment. In other texts he has expressly declared the certainty of it, and none need doubt the power of God to effect it. The universality of this subjection is beyond fair debate, the nature or kind of it, is the ground alone on which you can contend with Universalists. To this I paid some attention in my last letter, and before I close these communications, will afford additional evidence. I only here remark, that the subjection mentioned 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, is the same as in the passage before us. The subduer is the same person, the subjects to be subdued are the same, and the same original word, is used to express the subjection in both

passages. They must stand or fall together, as it respects the subject under discussion.

4th. Suffer me to ask, how you can avail yourself of *ta panta* as signifying the universe when Christ is said to be the Creator of it, and deny this liberty to the Universalists, when Christ is said to reconcile or subdue it? By what rational means do you slide, or rather leap over this difficulty? Perhaps it did not occur to you in the heat of the controversy with Mr. Channing, what use might be made of your explanation of *ta panta*, as meaning the universe, to establish universal salvation. I think, you cannot but feel the necessity under which your explanation of *ta panta* has laid you, to come forward and own yourself a Universalist, or rationally and scripturally to state, how you reconcile your explanation with your limited views of salvation. Unless this is done, I must think your weapon forged for Mr. Channing, has wounded yourself. Supposing in the passages I have brought to your view, you should come forward and tell us, that *ta panta* only means a part of the universe, would not Mr. Channing smile to see you thus do away all the force of your argument against him. Unless you admit that *ta panta* means the universe when Christ is said to subdue or reconcile it, how can you look Mr. Channing in the face and maintain, that it means this when he is said to create it. You know this is the strongest argument in your book to prove the divinity of Christ against him; but you must relinquish it, or admit universal

salvation. You are too shrewd a man not to perceive the force of this statement, and I hope too candid and honorable to refuse some explanation. I cannot certainly say but you may be able to show, how your explanations are consistent with limited salvation, but certainly I cannot perceive how it can be done. I want information.

The next passage to which I invite your attention, is Eph. i. 10—‘That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things, (*ta panta*) *the universe* in Christ both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him.’ Notice again, sir, that the *all things* here as in the former passages, is *ta panta the universe*. The person in whom the all things, or universe is to be gathered together, is expressly said to be Christ: and by whom the all things are to be gathered together in him, we learn from verses 3—8. of the chapter. In reference to the subject before us there are two things which demand particular attention.

1st. What is to be understood by the gathering in one all things in Christ? Let it then be noticed, that the apostle not only says, that it is *ta panta* which you say means *the universe* which is to be gathered together in Christ, but he adds, ‘both which are in heaven and which are on earth even in him.’ I must again remind you, that ‘things in heaven and things on earth’ you say is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and Greek writers for the universe.’ The apostle then, by your own explanation, makes this mat-

ter doubly sure. He first gives us (*ta panta*) *the universe*, and then the common periphrasis of it. You have then by your own comments placed this matter beyond fair debate, that the universe in the dispensation of the fulness of times, is to be gathered together in one in Christ.

But let us consider what ought to be understood by this gathering together. I presume it will not be disputed, that this gathering together, is for substance the same thing, as is expressed in I Cor. xv. 24-28, by Christ's subduing all things to himself. And the same as is expressed in Col. i. 20, by his reconciling all things to himself, or to take your own comment on this last text, by gathering together all things in Christ, 'seems evidently to be meant, bringing into union, under one great head, i. e. Christ; by a new and special bond of intercommunication, both angels and men.' The subject, the circumstances, and the language in all these texts, are so much the same that they need only to be read and your comment ought to be admitted. Curiosity led me to turn to Parkhurst on the word (*anakefalaiosasthai*) here translated 'gather together.' He thus explains it—'to gather together again in one; to reunite under one head.' Eph. i. 10, compare verse 22, and see Wolfius and M'Knight. You see then, that Parkhurst and you agree about this gathering together in one. The universe, according to these statements is to be gathered together again in one, or to be reunited under one head which is Christ. How this can be denied or evaded I am unable to divine.

I cannot forbear noticing here, that if any further evidence was needed to prove, that the subjection to Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 24-28, and Heb. ii. 8, was a voluntary subjection, a conclusive argument seems to be furnished in the passage under consideration. Do you ask what this is? It is this, that the gathering spoken of, is a gathering *together*, and a gathering together in *one*, yea, a gathering together in one *all things or the universe in Christ*. According to the common faith, which I presume you believe and preach, so far from the wicked being gathered in Christ, and gathered together in one in him with the righteous, they are to be separated from them forever. But according to the apostle, and even according to yourself, the universe is to be gathered together again and reunited under one head, Christ. Surely with no propriety can it be said, that the wicked and righteous are gathered together in one in Christ, if this is not voluntary. What kind of reunion could it be of the universe in him, if the greater part is to remain in eternal rebellion against God? It must be a strange special bond of intercommunication, by which such different beings are held together. How the wicked in misery forever, can be said to be *in Christ*, and *gathered together*, yea, *reunited in him* with the rest of the universe, I must leave you to explain, for it is beyond my comprehension.

2. Let us now consider *the time*, in which this gathering together in one all things, (*ta panta*) *the universe* is to be accomplished. It is, 'in the

dispensation of the fulness of times. To ascertain the meaning of this sentence, it will be necessary to pay some attention to the Greek words translated, *dispensation*, *fulness*, and *times*. *Oikonomian* translated *dispensation*, says Parkhurst, signifies, 'A spiritual dispensation, management or economy, 1 Cor. ix. 17; Eph. i. 10, and iii. 2; Col. i. 25; 1 Tim. i. 4. *Oikonomian Theu*, the dispensation of God, i. e. of divine grace or favor to man through Christ.'

On the word *Pleromatos*, translated *fulness*, Parkhurst thus writes, '*The fulness of time denotes the completion of a particular period of time before ordained and appointed.* Eph. i. 10; Gal. iv. 4.' It ought to be noticed here, that he not only quotes the text we are considering, but the phrase in it, 'the fulness of time,' which he explains, '*a particular period of time before ordained and appointed,*' and '*the completion*' of this particular period of time.

On the word *kairon* translated *times*, he thus writes, 'Severianus thus distinguishes between *chronos* and *kairos*; *chronos*, says he, denotes *mekos* the length or space of time, but *kairos* signifies *eukairian*, due or proper time, opportunity.'

Such Sir, are the explanations of Mr. Parkhurst, who was not a Universalist. Let us put these together and see what they amount to. 'That in the dispensation or economy of divine grace or favor to man, and in *the completion* of the time before ordained and appointed, yea the

due or proper time, he might gather together in one (*ta panta*) the universe in Christ even in him.' It ought to be observed, that the apostle does not say, 'that in the dispensation of the fulness of time, but *times*. At various periods of time during this dispensation of grace, God had gathered together in Christ part of the all things or universe; and as has been already noticed, this is to be completed just before Christ delivers up the kingdom to God, or as in this passage, the completion or fulness of times. Some additional remarks I shall have occasion to make on the word 'times' in considering the following passage.

Acts iii. 20, 21—'And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of *all things* (*panton*), which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.' I need not inform you, that (*panton*) in this passage, as in Heb. i. 1—4, is equivalent to (*ta panta*) the universe. The following things in it demand consideration.

1st. The restitution mentioned. The original word (*apokatastasis*) translated *restitution*, signifies, 'restitution, restoration, regulation.'—See Parkhurst. After other remarks, he says, 'But Raphelius comparing Acts iii. 21 with 1 Cor. xv. 25, thinks that (*apokatastasis*) properly signifies *a settling of all things, or a restoring of them to a state of tranquility after wars and tumults*. This learned and accurate critic shews that Polyb-

ius applies the word in this view, comparing 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25.' If this person, whom Parkhurst calls *a learned and accurate critic*, be correct in his explanation of this word, it not only establishes the doctrine of universal salvation, harmonizes with 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, and other texts, but exhibits something peculiarly pleasing to the mind. What, my dear Sir, has this world been since sin entered it but the theatre of wars and tumults? So much so, that the heart sickens at the tale of woe, which history and even our own experience afford. Is it not then a heart reviving consideration, that the period is to arrive, when tranquility and peace shall be restored to all the universe of God? But you know, Sir, that according to the common doctrine of the endless punishment of a great part of the human race, tranquility and peace shall never be restored to all the universe. No; instead of any thing like this being accomplished at the period mentioned in this text, it is then properly speaking, that eternal tumult and misery are to commence. One thing is certain, that if the word restitution in this passage means any thing good, this good is to all, for it is 'the restitution of all things (*panton*) the universe.' But let us

2d. Consider *the time* at which this restitution of all things is to be accomplished. Something has been said on this point already, and if I do not mistake, something further may be learned from this passage. Let it be then observed, that in Acts i. 9—12, we have an account of Jesus

being received up into heaven. In the passage before us, we are told, 'the heavens must receive him (or rather retain him) until the times of the restitution of all things.' The time then of this restitution of all things, is that mentioned in Acts i. 11, when Jesus shall so come in like manner as the disciples saw him go into heaven.' Observe Sir, the precise agreement of Luke in this passage, with Paul in the passages already considered. They agree not only in the work to be done, but also the time of its accomplishment. Luke calls the work to be done the restitution of all things, and Paul calls it subduing all things, and both agree as to the time, the coming of Jesus.

In addition to the remarks above on the word '*times*' I submit for consideration the following. The '*times of the restitution.*' The word *chronos*, signifies, according to Parkhurst, 'time, or denoting the completion or duration of time.' May not Luke therefore use the language in the plural to intimate, that, at this period, this restitution partially going on at different times, should then be fully and finally accomplished. According to the remarks of Parkhurst, it means 'the completion of the times of the restitution of all things or the universe.' I am aware, that some of the best Greek scholars say, 'nouns when used in a general or in an amplified sense are often put in the plural, although the things which they signify are naturally singular.' It would be tedious to enter into a minute consideration here, but in this and other texts, where the word

times occurs, I would request those who have more time to spare than I have, to give the texts at least an examination. But be this as it may, it does not in the least affect the general remarks which have been made on the above passages.

I am your's respectfully,

W. BALFOUR.

LETTER VIII.

April 14, 1821.

SIR,—The next passage I quote for your consideration is, Heb. i. 1—4. ‘God who at sundry times, and in diverse manners spake in times past unto the fathers, by the prophets, hath in these last days, spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, (*panton*) by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things (*ta panta*) *the universe* by the word of his power,’ &c. Notice here, that Christ is said to uphold all things, or, (*ta panta*) *the universe*. Is not this the same *all things*, which in the passage he is said to be heir of? What he upholds, and what he is appointed heir of, are the same, and this is, (*ta panta*) *the universe*. Christ then is appointed

heir, or as some translate and explain the passage, 'possessor of the universe.' He is not indeed yet come into the full possession of his inheritance, but we are assured that all things are to be subdued to him. I need not stop to notice, how exactly this passage agrees with Phil. ii. 9, 10, and Rev. v. 13, and your comments on them. Passing this, permit me to ask,—If Christ is the heir of the universe, will he leave any part of his inheritance unsubdued? You know that according to the popular belief, a great part of this inheritance, is to remain forever in rebellion and misery. But I ask further, if the greater part of the human race are to live in eternal rebellion and misery, is Christ very highly exalted, or honored, by being appointed heir to such an inheritance? But permit me to ask once more, if a great part of the universe is to continue forever in rebellion and misery, may it not be said with more truth, that the devil is appointed heir of the universe? And that God hath given all things into his hands? I am shocked myself, sir, at such questions, but I put them for the purpose of leading you, and myself, and all my readers, to a candid and careful re-examination of this very important subject. It is possible we may be mistaken. Indeed, if we are not, but it is a fact, that all who have not given evidence in this world of being subdued to Christ, are to perish forever, the greater part of the universe of God in ages past have certainly perished. I presume you do not believe, that more than one in ten of those

living in what are called Christian lands give such evidence. In a sermon by Mr. WARD, lately from India, he made the following statement. India within the Ganges, contains one hundred and fifty millions of human beings, all, not only without the knowledge of God, but grossly and superstitiously wicked. This course, such an immense population, had been pursuing for two thousand years. You can easily calculate, what an immense number during this period must have perished forever. But what is even this to the whole world, since God created man upon it. It is the mere dust of the balance to those, who must now be lifting up their eyes in hopeless despair. Whether this doctrine be true or not, one thing I am convinced cannot be true. It is this Sir,—that the greater part of men who have preached, and do now preach this doctrine, do not believe it themselves. Had they no doubts of its truth, what zeal, what labors, what hardships, what self-denial, what disinterestedness, should we not see in them to save men from such misery. I am disposed, from the sermons I heard Mr. Ward preach, to think he is at heart a Universalist. I infer this, from the texts he selected to preach from, the universal sentiments he advanced about the subjects of Christ, the quotations he often made from the bible in proof and illustration of his subject, and his hardly ever introducing a single sentence about the future and eternal misery of so many human beings. His claims in their behalf, were for the most part, if

not entirely urged, on the ground of reclaiming them from their present ignorance, superstition and wretchedness. To the best of my recollection, I never heard him once urge the argument of future eternal misery in his discourses. To put eternal misery out of the question, is not the reclaiming men from such things, worthy of all that has been done, or can be done, by those who know the blessedness of the gospel and its effects. I have introduced these remarks to show, that if Christ is the appointed heir of the universe, and if the common views of men about those to be saved are correct, but few comparatively are to be his obedient and happy subjects. This is what time past warrants us to say, and admitting that the gospel is successful to the full extent of our expectations in the time to come, yet it must be allowed, if the greater part of the human race are at last saved; yet not a few of them are perished for ever. But I proceed to notice,

Phil. iii. 21, ‘Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things (*ta panta*) the universe unto himself.’ It is here as in the preceding texts, ‘*ta panta, the universe.*’ Besides, the word translated *subdue*, is the same as in 1 Cor. xv. 24 to 28. Heb. ii. 8, and other texts already considered. If I have proved that the subjection in these texts, is a willing subjection, the proof equally applies here. In this text Christ’s ability to subdue all things to himself, is

expressly asserted, and I presume you will not dispute his willingness. Indeed this is included in the word which expresses his ability. It deserves our notice, Sir, that this subjection, is said to be '*unto himself.*' This language corresponds to the language of 1 Cor. 15th, Col. 1st, and other texts, which have been considered.

There are, my dear Sir, a number of texts more, in which *ta panta* occur, or, what is equivalent to *ta panta*, which I might introduce. But as these would lead to similar remarks, I deem a distinct consideration of them unnecessary. Suffer me therefore in a general way to notice the following things. In examining the passages where *ta panta* occurs, &c. I have observed, 1st. That the creation of *all things* or *ta panta the universe* is ascribed to God the Father. Heb. iii. 4. Rev. iv. 11. Rom. xi. 36. 2 Cor. v. 18. 1 Cor. viii. 6. 2 Peter iii. 4. Acts xiv. 15. Eph. iv. 6. Notwithstanding that in these passages God the Father is said to have created all things, yet I find,

2d. That in the following he is said to have created *all things*, or *ta panta the universe*, by Jesus Christ. See Col. i. 16. Heb. ii. 10. Eph. iii. 9. 1 Cor. viii. 6. John i. 3. Not only is the universe said to be made by him, but also for him. Heb. ii. 10. Besides he is said to uphold all things. Heb. i. 4. Suffer me to notice,

3d. That these *all things*, or *ta panta the universe*, which Christ is said to have made, and up-

holds, and which is for him, as well as by him, he is expressly said to be, '*appointed heir of,*' to be Lord of, Acts x. 36. And that the Father hath delivered it to him, Mat. xi. 27. Yea given it into his hands, John iii. 35, and xiii. 3. And that God hath given him power over it, John xvii. 2. Matt. xxviii. 18. Compare John v. 20, and xvi. 15, and xvii. 7.

Here, Sir, I finish my remarks on the texts in which *ta panta* are found. In concluding, I shall state for your serious consideration, some things which occurred to me in the course of my investigations.

1st. Is not the number of texts, which I have brought forward, about as many as you have done, to prove the divinity of Christ? If you should say, you only brought forward a few out of the many which you could have adduced in proof of this doctrine; it is likely the Universalist would reply, that I have only afforded a small specimen of the texts, which they could adduce in proof of theirs. But what you observe to Mr. Channing, I think is just, that it is not the number, but the nature of the texts which can prove any doctrine. A law a thousand times repeated, does not make it more certainly a law, than if only mentioned once. But,

2d. Are any of the texts which you have quoted in proof of Christ's divinity, more plain and explicit than those I have quoted in proof of universal salvation? Does any one text say more plainly and explicitly that Christ is God,

than the texts I have quoted say, that *all things* shall be subdued unto him, and that God hath by him reconciled *all things* unto himself? How then do your texts prove Christ's divinity, and those I have quoted do not prove universal salvation? Pray deliver yourself from this arbitrary mode of explaining the Bible if you can do it, by some rational explanation. How can you blame Mr. Channing and others for explaining away your plain texts in favor of Christ's divinity, and yet feel no blame in explaining away equally plain texts in favor of universal salvation. Candor and consistency certainly demand, that you should not be silent upon this subject.

3d. Have I, in these letters, or do Universalists, resort to the original languages and put them to the torture to prove their doctrine, as you, and those whom you oppose, do in the controversy about the trinity? This, I think, will not be asserted. The force of all I have advanced, you have furnished me in your criticisms about *ta panta*. I have only shown, that in judging Mr. Channing you have condemned yourself. So far as I have looked into the writings of Universalists, I find they take our common translation as they find it, and attempt to prove their doctrine by it. Your comments, and your criticisms on the original, as I think I have shown, both tend strongly to confirm them in their opinions. The orthodox, are not more under obligations of gratitude to you for your letters in proving Christ's divinity, than are the Universalists, in establishing universal salvation.

4th. In any one of the texts on which I have commented, what false rule of interpretation have I adopted, to wrest it from its plain obvious meaning? If my rules of interpretation are false, yours cannot be true, for they are the same. I will feel greatly obliged to you, or any other man, who will show in a single instance, that I have deviated from your rules of interpretation or modes of reasoning.

5th. Could you have availed yourself of as many explanations and concessions from Mr. Channing, as I have done from you and Dr. Campbell, what would you have said? Had he in a controversy with the Universalists, intimated as plainly that Christ is the supreme God, as you have done that the universe shall perform spiritual and divine worship to Christ, would you not have quoted him with triumph? You have quoted authors in your letters in proof of your views. I therefore put this question solemnly to your conscience,—Are any of your quotations more plainly and forcibly to your purpose in proof of Christ's divinity, than those I have made from you and Dr. Campbell, are in favor of universal salvation? If you have proved that spiritual worship is rendered to Christ, and if this proves his divinity, it is equally plain by your own explanations the universe are to perform it, and this proves universal salvation. I am sure you are too sensible a man not to perceive this, and I hope too candid to deny it.

6th. It seems to me, that in proving three per-

sons in the God-head, you are obliged to adopt a course, which the Universalists seldom if ever do in proving universal salvation. I shall explain myself. Is it not a fact, Sir, that the doctrine of *three* persons in the God-head, is attempted to be proved by passages, and these few in number, by way of inference? These inferences are sometimes not of the most obvious kind. Do not the Universalists quote plain declarations of scripture in proof of their doctrine? Besides, when you are pushed into a corner by argument in proving your doctrine, is it not common to take shelter in this,—‘*It is a mystery.*’ Have you ever found a Universalist flee for refuge to any thing like this? It is very common with you, in regard to the trinity, to say, ‘*The fact is revealed, the mode we do not undertake to explain.*’ Universalists not only refer you to passages declaring the fact, that all men shall be saved, but to texts shewing how this is to be done. In short, do you ever hear of Universalists talking about their doctrine, as is often done about the trinity,—‘That it is above reason, though not contrary to it,’ and spending volume after volume to explain their doctrine as is done about the trinity, yet leaving us as far from understanding it as ever? Do they use a word in defining their doctrine as you do the word *person*, which no man ever has, and I fear will be able to tell us, what is meant by it? It is evident, that you felt puzzled and perplexed with it; so much so, that you wish it had never been used in the symbols of

the churches. You forget my dear Sir, to inform us, what ought to have been used instead of it, or what you would substitute in its place if it was laid aside. If Universalists are driven to such perplexities in defence of their doctrine, I shall hesitate to pronounce it truth. In fine; is the doctrine of three persons in one God, a doctrine more capable of proof from the Bible, and more consonant to right reason and common sense, than the doctrine of universal salvation? Had you been brought up a Universalist as you have been a trinitarian, and universal salvation was an article in the Andover creed, yea your place as Professor and temporal interest led you to defend it as you have done that of the trinity, which of these two doctrines could you most easily defend? Could you not adduce as many, and as powerful arguments, drawn from scripture, reason and common sense, to support the one, as you have done in support of the other? I think you would at least hesitate to answer this question in the negative.

7th. Whether does the doctrine of universal salvation, or its opposite, give the most honorable and amiable view of the character of God, and which is most calculated to produce peace and good will among men? As to the first of these, little need be said, for surely if the doctrine of universal salvation can be fairly and fully established from the Bible, it, to the reason of men, has the preference. It is not very easy for us to see, God's character honorable and amiable, in

bringing a vast number of beings into existence, whom he foresaw would be (not to say as some do predetermined that they should be) for ever miserable. I never found one who thus talked about God's dooming some to endless misery, that ever believed themselves of this number. To say the least, those who thus speak of such a tremendously awful subject, have given too just cause for Universalists to say,—that the God of such persons, if they say the truth about him, is very like a tyrant. As to the second, certainly the doctrine of universal salvation, if it is proved to be true, has the advantage of the other in promoting peace and good will among men. The doctrine, is what every unbiassed, benevolent mind wishes true, if consistent with the will of God. It is what every good man prays for, that all may be saved, and what his exertions go to promote. Admitting the doctrine true for a moment, though men might look on each other as wrong in many respects, yet not as finally to be excluded from happiness. Contemplating each other as children of the same Father, and finally to enjoy the same blessedness in heaven, it is surely better calculated to beget peace and benevolence among them, than the opposite doctrine which leads to endless strife and contention here, and one party consigning the other over to endless misery in the world to come. If the doctrine can be proved beyond dispute true, I think you will allow, that all the religious sects may bear with each other, yea live in union together. But,

8th. It is not true as some have affirmed, and as some, to prevent inquiry, have held up as a bug-bear to others, that this doctrine leads to licentiousness. Say some, if I believed this doctrine true, I would take my fill of sin. This, Sir, I have always considered very unfair treatment of the Universalists. It will be used by no man, who does not wish to excite popular prejudice against them. The same argument was brought against the apostles, and indeed is to this day brought against every man, who preaches the grace of God as they did. If the grace of God, teaches one man to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, it also teaches all who know it. If it teaches one to say, it teaches all to say,—‘Shall we, sin, because grace aboundeth? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein.’ No Universalist that I have heard of, ever held the doctrine that men were saved *in their sins, but hold that all men are or will finally be saved from their sins.* To draw inferences from their doctrine, which they do not admit but deny, and such inferences as men do and have drawn from the doctrine of grace, by which any can be saved, is far from being honorable. Misrepresentation may indeed, for a time, promote the cause of a party, but never can serve the cause of truth. A man conscious of truth on his side, despises such dishonorable means to promote it in the world. About this I am confident we are agreed.

9th. But you may say, are there not many

passages of scripture which seem irreconcilable with the doctrine of universal salvation? I admit this, but submit for your serious consideration the following remarks. Are there more texts to be found which appear irreconcilable with universal salvation, than there are found which seem irreconcilable with the doctrine of the trinity? You well know what a host of texts your opponents muster against your views. They have not a few texts which are, or seem to be explicit in setting aside your views. Even some of these, yourself and other trinitarian writers have admitted are not without force, and feel not a little perplexed in reconciling them with this doctrine. I more than doubt, if the number of texts against your views are not greater, and I fear you would find yourself at as much loss to explain them consistently with the doctrine of the trinity, as the Universalists those texts which militate against their doctrine. In this respect they at least stand on equal ground with you, and for the same reason I should reject their doctrine, I ought not to believe yours. I might urge here, that the texts in which it is, or seems to be taught, that Christ is not the supreme God, are far more in number, and are as explicit, as those which seem to teach that all men will not finally be saved. But I have to urge here, can we find any texts which more strongly and plainly declare, that part of the universe are to be eternally miserable, than has been adduced to prove that the universe shall be subdued to Christ, and shall render to him spiritual

and divine worship. I think, I have shown from the texts you have quoted, and the comments you have made, that your statements are at variance with your views of eternal misery. They are to me perfectly irreconcilable with it. I have called, and do again call upon you to show, how they can be reconciled. When you have done this, it is no more than reasonable, that you demand of the Universalists to reconcile their doctrine with those texts which are at variance with it. If their views are at variance with the scriptures, I think I have shown that you are at variance with yourself. Could I have quoted as much from a Universalist, as I have done from you in favor of eternal misery, would you not have said that he contradicted his own received doctrine. But I have further to remark, that though we may in our writings contradict ourselves, one thing is certain, that God does not contradict himself in the Bible. The contradictions men perceive there, arise from their ignorance, and vanish as they become better acquainted with it. I do study this book, and wish to avail myself of every means to ascertain its true meaning, for, to ascertain this, I most cordially agree with you is true orthodoxy. That we may both study it as we ought, be taught by the spirit of all truth to understand it, and confess and practice what it reveals, is the sincere desire of yours respectfully.

W. BALFOUR.

[I fondly thought, Mr. Stuart would have made some reply to these additional letters. But after waiting two

months in expectation, and no reply being made, I concluded to make one effort more, and accordingly wrote him the following communication. I wished him to know, to what result his book with my own investigations were likely to lead me. I still hoped, he might make an effort to save me from Universalism.]

LETTER IX.

June 16th, 1821.

SIR,—Permit me only once more to address you. If you thought my communications unworthy of an answer, you might have said so in a few words, and perhaps I might have been satisfied. At the time I wrote them, I considered there were things stated, which required some explanation from you, and have not yet seen any reason to change my opinion. I find a writer in the Universalist Magazine of May 12th, whose signature is R. C. is of the same mind. Though unknown to me, I feel obliged to him in urging you to reply to my communications. I hope what he has said, may induce you to do, what you must feel an incumbent duty,—*To reconcile your statements with the doctrine of endless misery.* If you can do this, and yet refuse to do it, be pleased to assign some reason for your conduct.

My object in writing you once more I shall now explain. Since I first wrote you, the little time I can spare, has been employed in examining this subject. I have directed my attention to the scriptures, and all my researches are conducted with this view, to ascertain what is truth. The plan I have laid down, is on an extensive scale, and find it will take much time and labor to finish it. It has cost me much time and labor already, and I increasingly find it will require much more, before all my researches are completed. I do not wish to anticipate the final result, but so far as my investigations have yet been conducted, I fear, that if I am an honest man, I must be a Universalist. Now my dear Sir, I wish you on reading this to pause and ask yourself, 'Am I doing right, not to interpose to prevent this result? Can I thus suffer a man to be led astray by any thing I have written, after such repeated and earnest solicitations for necessary explanations? Should this man perish, and others through his instrumentality, all originating from my book, can I wash my hands and say, I am clean, your blood be upon your own head?' The God of heaven be witness between us, that the statements on which I took the liberty to remark, were the means of shaking my faith, and yet you refuse to say any thing to re-establish it. I solemnly declare, that I have been sincere in all I have written, and unfeignedly have desired, that you would show me, if possible, how you reconcile your statements with the doctrine of eternal mis-

ery. I have urged you until I am ashamed, yet you assign no reason for your silence. What am I, Sir, in such a case to do? Is there any other alternative left me, but either to shut my eyes, quiet my convictions, and sit down contented; an implicit believer in the doctrine of eternal misery; or, to gird myself to the task, candidly and patiently to examine this subject fully for myself? The last of these I prefer, and if life and health be granted me, shall give it a very full investigation. Should my inquiries end, as I fear they must, you may perhaps have an opportunity of seeing, that I have neither hastily, nor carelessly made up my mind on this very important subject. The observations I have already by me, collected in my examination of the scriptures, are by far too voluminous for Magazine communications. I shall not trouble the world with another book, if I have not something to offer on this subject, strong and conclusive. I feel a solemn responsibility for what I may write, knowing that it will outlive me, and may be doing much mischief in the world, when it is out of my power to prevent it. If you have got any thing to offer, I entreat you now to produce it. I am open to conviction. What is truth is my object, and to argument and evidence drawn from the scriptures I shall pay attention, from whatever quarter they may come. To any other mode of settling this question, I shall be like the deaf adder. When once my investigations are finished, and I am fully satisfied that the Bible teaches no such doc-

trine as endless misery, I shall neither be afraid nor ashamed to avow it, and if necessary to defend it. My views may then possibly be submitted to you and the world at large for examination.

If any thing which I could say or do, would induce you to come forward to prevent me from imbibing error, most gladly would I perform it. If after this, you still refuse to comply with my reasonable request, all the world, yourself not excepted, ought to free me of blame. If any thing uncandid in my matter, or indecorous in my manner, has induced you to be silent, forgive me this wrong. Nothing could be further from the feelings of my heart towards you. Believe me I very highly esteem you, and am sorry to bid you adieu.

W. BALFOUR.

[This letter, drew forth from Mr. Stuart the following answer, addressed to the Editor of the Magazine.]

To the Editor of the Magazine,

SIR,—I acknowledge the receipt of several numbers of your paper, containing letters addressed to me, by some anonymous author. In a recent number, which I have received, the author seems to take it hardly, that I have not noticed any of his former communications. I have surely had no intention to treat him ill; and I believe I may venture to say, that he has no just reason to complain of me. Anonymous animadversions in newspapers may be replied to by those, who have no other occupation which prevents their

engaging in composing pieces of such a nature. But every man, who is deeply engaged in professional business may surely be excused from this kind of warfare.

Besides ; if your correspondent be really a serious Inquirer after truth, as he professes to be, he could certainly choose some better method of research than by writing newspaper criticisms. Can he candidly believe, that I am obliged to spend my time in *writing* discussions, for the satisfaction of a single individual, which would occupy the time that must be spent in performing duties that relate to many ? or does he think, that I love to court disputes ?—In his private letter to me, why did he not, like an honest inquirer after truth, give his name, that I might reply to his letter ? Or why, if he wishes to know my sentiments relative to his exegesis of certain passages of the scripture, did he not call on me, or seek an opportunity of personal and friendly conference ? This he could have at almost any time.

In short, to speak plainly, I have thought from what I have read, that your correspondent has already fixed his system of belief, and only wished to solicit to a dispute. For this I have no desire ; though of it I have no fear. But I must know the name and object of my antagonist, before I enter the lists ; and contend on some other ground than that of a newspaper.

If your correspondent is not satisfied with these reasons, he can easily obtain satisfaction, by a friendly conference. I am indeed quite unable

to reason as he does about the meaning of the scriptures—but I cannot spare time to give the reasons for such dissent in writing, at present.

Your obed't. servant, M. STUART.

Andover, 19th June.

[To this letter of Mr. Stuart's, we returned the following answer, which closed my communications.]

LETTER X.

August, 11, 1821.

SIR,—I am glad you notice my communications, but am sorry you do not comply with my reasonable request. You do not deny but that it was *reasonable*. It even seems to be admitted, that your statements on which I remarked, are at variance with the doctrine of eternal misery. I am not charged with having misunderstood you, treated you uncandidly, or used unkind and disrespectful language. You do not say, your statements are false, nor do you profess yourself able, and willing to reconcile them with this doctrine; but say things of me, which upon reflection, I think you must regret. For example, I am not a serious and honest inquirer after truth; my system of belief is already fixed: and that I am your antagonist, and only wish to solicit a dispute with you. Of the truth of these charges, I leave others to judge, from what I have written.

I can only say, my conscience bears me testimony, that in every one of them you are mistaken. Only shew how you reconcile your statements with the doctrine of eternal misery, and, however unsatisfactory your explanation may be to my mind, I shall be silent, unless you desire my further correspondence. This is the sum of all I ever requested. This, my dear Sir, is all I ask.

I was fully aware, that your time did not permit you to write at large on this subject. Such a demand I have never made. All I have requested, is, that in the briefest possible way, you give me a clue, or a few hints, whereby I can reconcile the statements you have made, with your belief in eternal punishment. You have been the cause (unintentionally) of creating difficulties in my mind; and I have thought that I had some claim on you for removing them. If I have increased these difficulties by my own investigations since I read your book, I have no claim on you for these, more than on any other man, but must settle them on my own responsibility the best way I can.

However, much such an explanation was *needed*, and however reasonable my request, it seems it is not *granted*. You must have the *name*, and *object* of your *antagonist*, and even then, you will not enter the list with him on the ground of a newspaper. I never was, my dear Sir, your antagonist. I never wished to enter the list with you, or solicit a dispute. How you can be yet ignorant of my object, is to me surprising. It is

then for your information this,—*Rationally, and scripturally to reconcile your statements, on which I used the freedom to comment, with the doctrine of endless misery.* My reasons for not giving my name at first, and why I yet decline doing so, I shall now briefly state. First then, because the world is ruled by names. As your name gives weight and force to all you say and write, I am not willing that mine should be the means of rendering *useless*, any thing which I have to advance. Let men judge what I say uninfluenced by my name. Farther, I had no occasion to give my name, for I was not writing an answer to your book, but only requesting some explanation from you, about a very small part of it. Besides, you could as easily shew, without my name, as with it, how you reconciled your statements with the doctrine of eternal misery. How my name could be of any service to you about this, I am unable to perceive. I may add that *common prudence* dictates, I should not give my name, until my mind is brought to some decision on this subject. You have unsettled my mind. I have urged you to say something to *establish* it; and, until, this is done, or I am convinced that the doctrine of eternal misery cannot be supported from the Bible, why should I give people occasion to say I had become a Universalist, when I am only using means to avoid it. But a still more powerful reason than all these, has operated with me, not to seek satisfaction by personal conference, or private letter. It is the following. I

am not the solitary individual, my dear Sir, who has been, or is likely to be affected by your statements. Every reader of your book, is liable to this. That reader is no honor to you, nor will he profit himself much, who reads your book so carelessly, as not to perceive, that your statements strongly go to prove the idea of Universal Salvation. So long as the sun and moon endure, you may be quoted to prove this doctrine. A writer in the Universalist Magazine avers, that he never saw in so few words, any thing so conclusive in support of their sentiments. Though this writer is unknown to me, and though I have never conversed with a single individual on the subject, I venture to say, that this declaration is that of the whole body of Universalists. I go further and say, that no candid reflecting man, who reads your book with attention, but must be of the same opinion. You see then, that with such impressions, I did not consider myself writing as you intimate, 'newspaper criticisms,' to oblige you to spend your time, 'in *writing* discussions for the satisfaction of a single individual.' No, my dear friend, I wished you to write for the benefit of *all* the Universalists, of *all* who read your book ; yea, of thousands yet unborn. You presume too much, if you think the Universalists so dull, as to overlook the pertinent statements you have made in their favor. Had I not brought them to view, long before now, they would likely have quoted you triumphantly. Why then blame me for not privately conferring with you for my own satisfac-

tion ; when so many require also to be satisfied, how you reconciled your statements with your professed belief. I think you rather ought to be thankful, that thus you had a fair opportunity of retracting your statements, or shewing to all men how you did reconcile them. What a blessed opportunity you here let slip of saying something to convince the Universalists, and to turn them from their error ; or, at least, to leave them inexcusable. Is it nothing to you, that they perish in their error ? and is it nothing to you that your statements tend to confirm them in it, and increase their number ?

I notice, that though you do not deny my communications to be without argument, yet you say, ‘ I am indeed unable to reason as he does about the meaning of the scriptures ; but I cannot spare time to give the reasons for such dissent in writing at present.’ May I use the freedom to suggest, that your time would not be unprofitably spent, in shewing to the young men under your care, how you reconcile your statements with the doctrine of eternal misery ; and pointing out to them the fallacious nature, and pernicious tendency of my reasoning about the meaning of scripture ? For my benefit, and that of the Universalists, yea of all others, you might easily give an abstract of your labors. I have to complain of the want of time as well as you. Be assured, Sir, it was not for the want of any other ‘ occupation’ I have engaged in writing. That man must be very busy indeed, if, in a similar state of mind with me, he

cannot redeem a little time to have his mind informed, and established on such a subject as the one before us. I really think you might have found a few moments, to reconcile your statements, and prevent their evil tendency on me, and *others*. About this subject, it is impossible for me to be at rest, until I either obtain satisfaction, or can persuade myself, that the future eternal conditions of men are mere trifles.

It appears to me, that you have some secret conviction, that I am in league with the Universalists, and that all this writing is intended to involve you in a controversy with them. If it were so, I can see no possible reason you can have for declining an explanation, how you reconcile your statements with eternal punishment. But I assure you no such thing is the case. What I have said is in the sincerity of my heart, and with no man on the face of the earth, have I ever exchanged a word on this subject.

I cannot part with you without saying, that if I have caused you one unpleasant feeling, I regret it. If I have, as you intimate, perverted by my reasonings any part of the word of God, I deeply lament it. That man I shall esteem my best friend, who will take the trouble to correct me. Having never wished any dispute with you, but information *from* you, and this being denied, it is useless to spend one moment's time more on the subject. If I even wished a dispute with you, I must write a book before I obtain it. This at present I am not prepared to do. Should I

ever be prepared, I hope I shall never write a book, for the sake of having a dispute with you, or any other man. This kind of work I shall leave, to be done by those who delight in it. Should you feel disposed to give me the information I have requested, I shall consider myself as very much obliged to you. If you have not time to do this, would you be kind enough to refer me to some work, in which I may find this information. If you decline both, you shall not very soon hear again from me, as I wish to devote all my leisure moments to the investigation of this deeply interesting subject. If want of time, be the reason why you do not reconcile your statements with the doctrine of everlasting misery, I am sure it cannot be for want of talents. Perhaps some may suspect that it arises from the impossibility of the thing. To me at present, it appears to be impossible. It is one thing for you not to fear a dispute with me, and quite another to perform an impossibility. If it can be very easily done, it only makes me the more urgent that it *should* be done. I am yours, &c.

W. BALFOUR.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

SUCH are my Letters to Mr. Stuart, and his note, declining all explanation, or reply to them. The reader can judge now, whether my request for an explanation was unreasonable, or that his silence was judicious.

In looking over these letters for their present publication, we have deemed it proper to read Mr. Stuart's letters again, which occasioned them. If in any case we had misunderstood or misrepresented him, now was the proper time to correct this, and apologise for it. And if he had modified, or explained away the statements on which we remarked, it was also proper to notice the parts of his letters, which contained such modifications and explanations. But after a careful reperusal of them, we cannot perceive, that in any case we have misunderstood or misrepresented his meaning. Such a charge, was never to our knowledge brought against us, nor do we think, he or any other person will bring it. So far from his making other statements, which modify or explain those on which our remarks are founded, we have discovered several things which strongly confirm them. On these additional statements of Mr. Stuart, I shall now make a few remarks, taking them up in the order I find them in his book.

1. On page 67 he asks—'But what are the 'all things, the universe (*ta panta*), which the *Logos* made, or created?' He thus answers. 'A part of these *ta panta*, are in v. 10 represented as (*o'kosmos*) the world; a term no where in the New Testament applied to the christian church, nor to men as morally amended by the Gospel.' Well, if this be true, and who can dispute it, it follows of course, that wherever *kosmos the world*, is used in the New Testament to designate *persons*, it must mean such as are *not morally amended by the Gospel*; the world that lieth in wickedness mentioned 1 John v. 19. What then does the New Testament say concerning *o'kosmos*, the

world, those *not morally amended by the Gospel*? Take the following texts as a specimen.

In 1 John iv: 14, it is said—‘And we have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son, to be the Saviour of the world, (*kosmos*).’ That is, according to Mr. Stuart, God sent the Son to be the Saviour of those not morally amended by the Gospel. And in John iv: 42, it is said by the Samaritans—‘Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world, (*kosmos*).’ That is, by Mr. Stuart’s own shewing, they knew that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of those not morally amended by the Gospel.

Again. In 1 Tim. i: 15, Paul says, ‘Jesus Christ came into the world, (*kosmos*) to save sinners.’ That is, Christ came into the world to save those *not morally amended by the Gospel*. In John iii: 17, it is said, ‘God sent not his Son into the world, (*kosmos*) to condemn the world (*kosmos*), but that the world (*kosmos*), through him might be saved.’ That is, according to Mr. Stuart, God sent not his Son into the world to condemn those not morally amended by the Gospel, but that those not morally amended by the Gospel might be saved. And in John xii: 4, ‘I came not to judge the world (*kosmos*), but to save the world (*kosmos*).’ That is, Christ came not to judge those not morally amended by the Gospel, but to save those not morally amended by the Gospel.

Again. It is said John i: 29, ‘Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, (*kosmos*).’ That is, according to Mr. Stuart, behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of those not morally amended by the Gospel. And 1 John i: 2, ‘And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world, (*olou tou kosmou*.*)’

* Compare with this text 1 John v: 19 in the Greek. The *whole world*, for whose sins Christ was a propitiation, includes Jews and Gentiles, or the whole human race. Mr. Stuart is far away from old *orthodoxy*, for it maintained, Christ was only a propitiation for the sins of the *elect*. Now it is current *orthodoxy* that he died for all men. Alas! what are we coming to in these days?

That is, according to Mr. Stuart, Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole of those not morally amended by the Gospel. And Christ says, John vi: 33, 'I am the bread of God which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world, (*kosmos*). Which means, according to Mr. Stuart, that Christ is the bread of God which giveth life unto those not morally amended by the Gospel. And Paul says, 2 Cor. v: 19, 'God is in Christ reconciling the world (*kosmos*), unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses.' That is, according to Mr. Stuart, God is in Christ reconciling those not morally amended by the Gospel to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.

Such are a specimen of the texts I might quote, in illustration of the point in question. On the whole of them let it be observed 1. Mr. Stuart is correct in saying, '*o'kosmos the world*, is a term no where in the New Testament applied to the Christian Church, nor to men as morally amended by the Gospel.' But it is evidently applied to those not morally amended by it, as the above texts shew. And he will agree with us when we add, that all the difference between the Church and them is, this moral amendment which the Gospel produces. Before they were morally amended, they formed a part of this very world which lieth in wickedness. And notwithstanding their moral amendment, they are no more fit for the future immortal state, than the world which still lieth in wickedness. It seems to be forgotten by *the Church*, that none are fitted for this state, but by being *sons of the resurrection*. But the Church talk, as if they were saved from hell and fit for heaven, and after all will confess that there is much sin and corruption about them. What member of the Church ever died a perfectly holy being? But if not perfectly holy and immortal, how are they fit for the heaven described in the Bible? And when they tell me, how they are to be purged from their sin and corruption after death, I will find a way for the purgation of all our race.

2. Seeing it is certain, *kosmos world*, designates those not morally amended by the Gospel, how can Mr. Stuart

make the above texts accord with his views of limited salvation? Is it not plainly taught, that Christ is the Saviour of them; that he did not come to condemn but to save them; that he is the propitiation for their sins; hath taken them away; God does not impute their trespasses unto them; but is in Christ reconciling the world to himself. Moreover, that Christ is the bread of God who giveth them life, etc. Now, we appeal to Mr. Stuart's good sense, if it is not ridiculous exaggeration in the sacred writers, to call Christ *the Saviour of the world*, if they believed only few of them comparatively were to be saved by him? And is it not insulting the misery of all not to be saved, to propose him as a Saviour to them? Let Mr. Stuart candidly consider, if believers in a partial salvation of our race, would have used such language as is contained in the above passages. He certainly will allow, that it suits Universalists, and seems to have been written on purpose to prove their sentiments. A believer in endless misery never could have written so loosely and unguardedly.

3. But I would ask Mr. Stuart, if Christ died for all, is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, yet the whole world is not to be saved by him, has he not died in vain for those not saved? He has suffered for the very sins for which the damned shall suffer forever. And although Christ took away their sins, God still imputes them to them, contrary to his own declaration. Nor can it be true, that Christ is the bread of God who giveth life unto the world, if *eternal death* is to abide upon them. According to modern orthodoxy, in which Mr. Stuart seems to be a believer, the damned in hell to all eternity, are just as much indebted to the death of Christ as any saint before the throne of God; he died as much for the former as the latter. Has not Mr. Stuart told them, that they have '*been redeemed by the death of God's own beloved Son?*' see Exegt. Essays p. 8. Pardon me for thinking it a diverse and strange doctrine, that all the subjects of endless misery, were redeemed by the death of Christ. Call it any thing but Calvinism, if Calvinism and Scripturism be the same thing. If

this be orthodoxy, what is heterodoxy? Not more than twenty years ago, it would have been called *rank Arminianism*, and reprobated by all good orthodox people.

2. Mr. Stuart pp. 68, 69 thus writes. 'In regard to the heavens being the work of Christ's hands,' it is an expression plainly of similar import to the one just examined, (foundation of the earth) and signifies the creation of the heavens. Thus Ps. viii. 4, 6; 'When I consider the heavens the work of thy hands;' which is parallell with, the moon and stars which thou hast ordained, (septuagint, *ethemeliosas*.) So in verse 6, 'and hast placed him over *the works of thy hands*; all things hast thou put under his feet; i. e. placed him over the creation.' Here Mr. Stuart tells us, that the words—'and hast placed him over the works of thy hands; all things hast thou put under his feet,' mean, 'i. e. placed him over the creation.' Very well. Let us then inquire for what purpose, God hath placed Christ over the creation.' Mr. Stuart shall inform us himself. On p. 101 of his letters, he quotes Rev. v. 8—14 and comments on it. As I have quoted the whole paragraph in my letters above, I shall only quote the following part of it. 'And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the lamb forever and ever.' To this Mr. Stuart immediately subjoins—'If this be not spiritual worship, and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine.' And on p. 100, he thus explains the language of the passage, 'things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers for the *universe* (*ta pan*, or *ta panta*).' See this more fully noted in the letters above.

It is very plain then from Mr. Stuart's own shewing, that God placed Christ over the creation or universe, for the purpose of its rendering spiritual and divine worship. He maintains the worship is spiritual and divine, and he shows the whole creation is to render it.

Whether it was God himself, or God by Christ who created the universe, is foreign to our present subject. But it may surely be asked, is it to the honor of either, to create a universe, when they must have foreseen a part of this universe would be miserable forever? Let Mr. Stuart say, if it was for God's pleasure it was created, can he believe it any pleasure to God, that instead of the whole creation rendering to him divine worship in heaven, a part must be miserable for ever in hell? Must the song of the redeemed, be accompanied with the howlings of the damned, to render it pleasing to Jehovah? And if God is pleased, with the endless punishment of a part of his rational creation, God and the devil, supposing such a being to exist, are both pleased with the same thing. The principal difference between God and the devil is, the latter would have been better pleased, had God's pleasure been, to make our whole race forever miserable. And why was not this his pleasure, if he is as much glorified by the groans of the damned as the songs of the saved? His impartiality, would at least have been more apparent to all his creatures.

3. Again Professor Stuart says p. 77. '*epi panton theos*, is literally, over all God,' i. e. supreme God. Compare with the phraseology here, the word *panta* (all) as used in a connexion which respects Christ, in Col. i. 17. Eph. i. 19—23. John xxxiii. 31. and 1 Cor. xv. 27. It is used in such passages, as a term of qualification, which serves to describe him as the *head* or *ruler of the universe*.' On this paragraph we have to remark—1st. Let it be granted, *epi panton theos*, is literally, *over all God*. And let it be also granted, that 'the word *panta* (all) as used in a connexion which respects Christ in' these texts, is 'a term of qualification, which serves to describe him as *head* or *ruler of the universe*.' These things being granted, which is all Mr. Stuart could desire, he can have no objection to see how *panton* and *panta* are used as terms of qualification to describe Christ in some other cases. We give the following texts as a specimen. In 2 Cor. v. 14, 15, we are told Christ 'died for all' (*panton*.) In 1 Tim. ii. 6, that he

‘gave himself a ransom for all’ (panton.) That God hath ‘appointed him heir of all’ (panton,) Heb. i. 2. and is by him to ‘reconcile all things (ta panta) unto himself,’ Col. i. 19, 20. And ‘that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, is to gather together in one all things (ta panta) in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him.’ That is, according to Mr. Stuart’s own statements, God is to gather together *the universe* in Christ. Accordingly, God hath ‘put all things, (panta) under his feet.’ Nor is Christ to deliver up the kingdom to God the father, until ‘all things (ta panta) are subdued unto him.’ Heb. ii. 8. 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. Besides, we are assured, Christ is ‘able to subdue all things (ta panta) unto himself.’ Philip. iii. 21. And the heavens are to retain him ‘until the restitution of all things (panton.)’ Phil. iii. 21. Acts iii. 21.

Such are a few of the texts, in which *panta*, *panton*, and *ta panta* are used. See others noticed in the letters. We now beg leave to ask Mr. Stuart, why these texts, should not be admitted as describing Christ, as dying for the universe; as being a ransom for the universe; as the heir of the universe; as the reconciler of the universe; as the gatherer together of the universe; as the subduer of the universe; and as the restorer of the universe, just as certainly as the texts he refers to, describe him ‘as the *head* or *ruler* of the universe? And if *panta*, *panton*, and *ta panta*, do not describe him universally such in the one case, how can they do so in the other? He cannot be the *universal head* or *ruler* of *the universe*, unless he admits him *universally* so, in all the other things just mentioned. If he is only the reconciler, the subduer, the restorer of a part of the universe, then he is only the *head* and *ruler* of a part of it. There is no way of evading this, at least we can perceive none; and if there is, we hope Mr. Stuart will point it out. His own principals of interpretation must make him a Universalist. He must either admit the force of these statements, or say, his argument is good for nothing against Mr. Channing.

Mr. Stuart, we think is correct in saying, ‘Christ is

the *head* or *ruler* of the universe;' and the texts just cited, with others shew for what important purposes God placed him over the universe, as head und ruler of it. But it is deeply to be lamented, that a man of Mr. Stuart's talents, should spend so much time and labor, shewing Christ is the *head* and *ruler* of the universe, yet says so little respecting the glorious ends to be accomplished by it. We beg of him to turn his attention to this. The subject he was discussing, did not directly lead him to say much about it, but the hints which he gives, must almost lead one to think he saw Universalism at the bottom of them. If he did not, it is strange he did not perceive, that in defending the doctrine of the trinity, he was at the same time destroying the doctrine of endless punishment.

2. But in the above quotation, Mr. Stuart desires us to compare Col. i. 17. Eph. i. 19, 23. John iii. 31, and 1 Cor. xv. 27. We have done so, and in turn, request him to compare these very passages with their contexts. Having done so, we beg of him to ask himself the following question. Do these texts more certainly teach that Christ is 'the *head* or *ruler* of the universe,' than their contexts teach he is the reconciler of it; or that in the fulness of times God is to gather together in one this universe in Christ? Having put this question to himself, let him then turn to his own letters p. 72, and read his own exposition of Col. i. 19, 20, one of the very texts he refers to above. I shall only here refresh his memory with a small part of it. He says—'By reuniting things in heaven, and things on earth, seems evidently to be meant, bringing into union, under one great head, i. e. Christ, by a new and special bond of intercommunication, both angels and men. In like manner, the two great parties on earth, Jews and Gentiles, are united together.' If God brings 'into union, under one great head, i. e. Christ, by a new and special bond of intercommunication, both angels and men;' and 'in like manner, the two great parties on earth, Jews and Gentiles are united together,' pray what more needs to be brought into union? Where shall Mr. Stuart find any disunion?

And if Christ is the bond of this union, what reason has he to think it will ever be broken? To speak of the angels in heaven, the damned in hell, and all on earth being united 'under one great head, i. e. Christ, by a new and special bond of intercommunication,' sounds strange enough. We cannot suppose he means any such thing. How then can he ever reconcile such statements, with his views of endless punishment?

4. Further, on pp. 97, 98, Professor Stuart thus writes. '2. *Divine power is ascribed to Christ.* Phil. iii. 21. 'Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.' Compare now with this passage, 1 Cor. xv. 26—28, where the same language is applied to God the Father. And if to subdue all things to himself, (*apotaxas ta panta eauto,*) be not characteristic of omnipotence in Phil. iii. 21, when applied to Christ; why should it be when applied in Corinthians xv. to the Father?' Let it be observed on this—1. If Christ does not save and subdue all mankind, according to Mr. Stuart, it is not for want of power to do it. No; for these texts are quoted by him to prove that '*Divine power is ascribed to Christ.*' That if *omnipotence* is ascribed to the Father in 1 Cor. xv. 26—28, he contends it is also ascribed to Christ, in Phil. iii. 21. If all are not then finally subdued and saved, it must be for want of *will* and *inclination* in Christ, a thing I hope he will not advocate. But perhaps he has embraced the *new orthodoxy*, that all depends on men whether they *will be pleased* to be subdued and saved. I shall be sorry if he has embraced a notion which makes the whole success of the travail of the Redeemer's soul, rest on the whim and caprice of fickle sinful men. What a great change must have taken place in orthodoxy? Now, people shall be willing in the day of their own power; but formerly, they 'shall be willing in the day of the Lord's power.' Psal. cx. 3.

2. But a very important question here is, about what is Christ's *power* or *omnipotence* said to be exerted, in Phil. iii. 21? 'He is able to subdue all things unto him-

self, *apotuxas ta panta eauto.*' Now, have we not seen from Mr. Stuart's own statements, that *ta panta*, means, 'the universe,' and that this universe, is to render to God and Christ spiritual and divine worship? But we are told in this passage, Christ is to 'change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body.' And this he is to effect, 'according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things (*ta panta, the universe*) unto himself.' If Christ then, does not effect this change on all, it cannot be from want of power to do it, for he is able to subdue the universe unto himself. Nor can it be from want of will and inclination to do it, for we are assured, he is to subdue *the universe* before he delivers up the kingdom to his father, and the last enemy to be destroyed is death. 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. And does not this very chapter shew, that the same change is to take place in all? which is from corruption to incorruption, from mortality to immortality. Nor is it very easy for any man to assign a satisfactory reason, why death should come by the first Adam to all, and yet by the second Adam, the resurrection from the dead should not come to all? Or, that we should all bear the image of the earthly Adam, and yet we shall not *all* bear the image of the heavenly? Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? And is not the wisdom from above without partiality?

5. Mr. Stuart says p. 101, after quoting Rom. x. 9—14. 'The Lord *on whose name they are to call*, is plainly Christ; for he is the same in whom *they are to believe*: (v. 11 and 14.) And this Lord, (Christ) on whom they are to call, and in whom they are to believe, is *kurios panton, universal Lord*, and therefore able to bestow the blessings which they need.' Here Mr. Stuart declares, 1. That Christ 'is *kurios panton, universal Lord*,' which in other places he explains thus, that he is 'placed over the creation,' etc.

2. On this universal Lordship of Christ, Mr. Stuart founds the conclusion, that he is 'able to bestow all needed blessings.' We would then respectfully ask him—what benefit it can be to our race, that Christ is

universal Lord, and is ‘*able to bestow all needed blessings*,’ if he is not just as *willing*, as he is *able*, to bestow them? Is it not rather a curse to that part of them, on whom he shall exert his omnipotent power, and exercise his universal Lordship, in making them suffer misery without relief and without end? Mr. Stuart surely could not mean, that Christ’s willingness to bestow all needed blessings, is less than his ability? Nor can we suppose he confines the bestowment of his blessings to believers in this world. If he does, he must believe in the endless misery of all the heathen world, who never heard of the name of Jesus. Besides, he must believe in the endless damnation of all who die in infancy, for they are physically and mentally incapable of believing in his name.

3. But let us see what the scriptures say of Christ’s Lordship. In Luke ii. 10, the angel said unto the shepherds—‘Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.’ But why to all people, or to Jews and Gentiles? The reason is given thus, verse 11. ‘For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord, (*kurios*).’ Here the glad tidings being to all people, or to Jews and Gentiles, are predicated on the universal Lordship of Christ. Hence Peter told the Jews, Acts ii: 36—‘Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified both Lord, (*kurios*) and Christ.’ And the same Peter, Acts x: 36, told the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius, ‘God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all, (*esti panton kurios*).’ Nothing can be more obvious, than that the glad tidings of life and immortality to Jews and Gentiles, are founded on the universal Lordship of Jesus Christ. Nor is his Lordship confined to all Jews and Gentiles alive, but is extended also to the dead. Hence Paul says Rom. xiv: 9—‘For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord, (*kurieuse*) both of the dead and living.’ Such is Christ’s universal Lordship. And that he is to exercise it, until

all are subdued, is out of all question. Mr. Stuart tells us himself p. 121, 'Christ is called Lord (*kurios*) because of his universal dominion.' And further says p. 124. 'Acting as such a head, all enemies are put under his feet.' See Psalm cx. Compare Matt. xxii: 41-45 and 1 Cor. xv: 24-28.

If it is asked, how is Christ Lord of the *dead*, as well as of the *living*. I answer, because he is to raise all the dead in the last day. In the resurrection, we are told, 1 Cor. xv: 42-46, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, as well as the living changed. Unless Christ was Lord of the dead as well as of the living, his Lordship would not only be very limited, but also of short duration. Yea, unless there shall be an endless succession of the generations of the human race, he would be left at last without any subjects on whom he could exercise his universal Lordship. The unnumbered millions of the dead, far exceed those now alive, and all in their turn must die, so that death would have universal and endless dominion over them. But 'to this end, Christ both died, and rose, and revived *that* he might be Lord both of the dead and living.' He is the first begotten from the dead, who arose to die no more; death now cannot have dominion over him. He is the first fruits of them who sleep, and because he liveth they shall live also.

When it is said Christ is Lord both of the dead and living, it includes our whole race, for all of them come under one or other of these two divisions. And his reign, or universal dominion, is to continue until every knee shall bow to him, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and the last enemy death is destroyed. For since by man came death by man also comes the resurrection from the dead, and as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, 1 Cor. xv. His universal Lordship over the dead as well as the living, will be manifested in his raising all up from death at the last day. He must be Lord of the dead who hath the power, to raise them from the dead. They were given to him by the Father, and he shall lose none of them, as we shall see presently.

Since writing the above, Mr. Stuarts Commentary on the epistle to the Romans has fallen into our hands. On chap. xiv. 9, he says—‘to be *Lord of the dead and of the living*, is, that he should be supreme ruler over the present world and the world of spirits; for the *living and the dead* make up all the human race.’ May I be permitted to ask, on what authority Mr. Stuart changes the Apostles words, ‘*the dead*’ into ‘*the world of spirits*’? Does not he mean by *spirits* living beings, or what he would call *immortal souls* in a future state? How then can they be *dead*? And if the Apostle meant this, he could have said this, just as easily as Mr. Stuart for him. Where did Mr. Stuart find such language as—‘*the world of spirits*’? Not in the Bible, for it contains no such language. We presume he derived it from the Jewish Rabbinical writings, or the heathen. See his exegetical Essays, where something like this is admitted.

But Mr. Stuart’s explanation, or rather alteration of the Apostle’s language, destroys all distinction between the dead and living mentioned in the passage. According to it there are no dead, unless Mr. Stuart’s *spirits* are dead in his *world of spirits*. He admits, ‘the living and the dead make up all the human race,’ and if his spirits in the world of spirits are alive, all the human race are living. But do the scriptures represent all the dead to be still alive? Do they not rather say, ‘*the dead know not any thing*?’ That at death their ‘*thoughts perish*.’ Were Universalists, to alter the language of the Bible to suit their system, in a similar way as Mr. Stuart does here, they would be counted infidels.

6. Again, on pp. 124, 125. Mr. Stuart thus writes. ‘So God is said to have highly exalted him, (Christ), and given him a name, above every name,’ Phil. ii. 9—11. In a similar way all power is given him in heaven, and on earth; i. e. he is constituted ‘head over all things to his church;’ Math. xxviii. 18. Acting as such a head, ‘all enemies are put under his feet;’ (1 Cor. xv. 25—27.) And this mediatorial dominion, when the work of a mediator is completed, will be resigned, at the final judgment, (1 Cor. xv. 28.)’ He adds, p. 131; ‘besides, in 1

Cor. xv. 28, it is affirmed, that when the enemies of the church shall be all subdued, the '*Son himself*' shall be *subject* to the Father, that God may be all in all.' Here we have several remarks to make. 1. Mr. Stuart seems here to forget, what he said p. 69, noticed above. Here he says, Christ 'is constituted head over all things to his church.' But there he told us, God placed him '*over the creation.*' And as an explanation added—'And hast placed him *over the works of thy hands*, all things hast thou put under his feet.' And we have just seen, that on p. 101, he says, Christ is—'*kurios panton, universal Lord.*' We have also seen in the letters, and also in the remarks above, that this universal Lordship, or being placed over the creation, is to bring all into a willing subjection to God.

2. But if we examine the texts, which Mr. Stuart here refers to, we shall find the writers explanations differ from his. Let us look at them. The first is Phil. ii. 9—11, which he partially quotes thus. 'God is said to have highly exalted him, and given him a name, above every name.' Mr. Stuart's explanation is—i. e. he is constituted 'head over all things to his church.' Let us now hear the apostles explanation. After saying God hath 'highly exalted him, and given him a name, above every name,' he adds—'that at the name of Jesus *every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth*; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the father.' This is somewhat a different explanation from his. And, have we not seen in the letters, that Mr. Stuart explains the language of the apostle just quoted, thus: 'Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, not for the *church* but for the *universe.*' And that this explanation is correct, may be seen from Exod. xx. 4. But such is his own comment, on the language of the apostle in this very passage, which he quoted on p. 100 of his letters to Dr. Channing to prove, 'that divine honor and worship are ascribed to Christ.' And that he thought his proof correct, is evi-

dent, for he added—‘What can be meant, by things in heaven, i. e. beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant?’ And ought he not to have also said—‘What can be meant by things on earth, and things under the earth, i. e. beings in earth and under the earth bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant?’ In fact he says as much as this, for he immediately adds—‘What other worship can heaven render? And if the worship of Christ in heaven be spiritual, should not that of others, who ought to be in temper united with them, be spiritual also? And when it is added, this worship shall be ‘to the glory of God the father ;’ I understand the sentiment to be, that Jesus in his mediatorial character is the proper object of universal adoration. But as this character, has a peculiar connexion with and relation to God the Father, so the worship paid to Christ the mediator, should redound to the glory of the Father as well as of himself.’ Mr. Stuart here then, is not only at variance with the Apostle’s comment, but he is even at variance with his own comment on the Apostles language.

The second passage which he quotes is Matt. xxviii: 18, and but partially thus. ‘In a similar way all power is given him (Christ) in heaven, and on earth.’ He gives the same explanation here as of the last passage thus, ‘i. e. he is constituted ‘head over all things’ to his church.’ But I ask, is this the Saviour’s explanation? No. Or, does he say, ‘Go ye therefore and teach *the church*. No; but Go ye therefore and teach *all nations*,’ etc. And I may add, if ‘all power is given to Christ *in heaven and on earth*,’ according to Mr. Stuart’s own explanation above, all power is given to him over the universe. But why give to any being, all power over the universe, unless there was a will or inclination to employ that power for the good of the whole universe? Without this, it would be dangerous to trust so much power in any beings hands. But all this power over the universe, was given to Christ for the purpose of subduing it, that all might worship Christ with spiritual and divine worship. This Mr. Stuart shews, as seen in the preceding letters and remarks.

Mr. Stuart's third text, is 1 Cor. xv. 25-27, which he quotes thus. 'Acting as such a head, 'all enemies are put under his feet, (1 Cor. xv. 25-27.) And this mediatorial dominion, when the work of a mediator is completed, will be resigned, at the final judgment. (1 Cor. xv: 28).' What Mr. Stuart means by the phrase '*final judgment*,' we presume is, sentencing some to the endless joys of heaven, and others to misery without end. But where does any sacred writer, use the phrase '*final judgment*,' or, the thing Mr. Stuart intends by it? In this very chapter, is given the fullest account of the resurrection of the dead in the Bible. The resurrection is one to all, and of the same nature to all, for not a hint is dropped, that at this period some are raised from the dead, to be forever miserable. No, the change in all raised from the dead, is, from mortality to immortality, from corruption to incorruption; and the last enemy death is to be destroyed to all alike. But, if Mr. Stuart's *eternal death*, is still to remain after this period, how can death then be swallowed up in victory? Say, if his *final judgement*, his *eternal death*, his *endless misery*, are scripture doctrines, was not 1 Cor. xv. the very place in the Bible where they ought to have been introduced?

Who, Mr. Stuart means by *the church*, he does not define; but we presume from the orthodox use of this phrase he restricts it to *believers*. But he should recollect, *the church*, in the Bible sense of this phrase, includes all those for whom Christ died; whom he loved, and gave himself for them. See Eph. v: 25-28. And that Mr. Stuart believes in universal redemption by Jesus Christ, is beyond all question. In his Exegetical Essays p. 8, he thus writes: 'The world by wisdom knew not God. Nor did they know that he had made man in his own image; much less that man had been redeemed by the death of God's own beloved Son.' I beg Mr. Stuart to consider: 1. Does he not in these words mean, that God hath redeemed *man, the world, the whole of mankind*, by the death of his beloved Son? The redemption, whatever it may be, is alike to them all, whether it be

redemption from sin, hell, or any thing else. It is one redemption, it is by Jesus Christ, and it is one to all.

2. The passage just referred to, Eph. v: 25-28, calls all those '*the church*,' whom Christ loved and gave himself for them: the very persons whom Mr. Stuart says God hath redeemed by the blood of his own beloved Son. And these included *man*, the whole of mankind, by his own shewing.

3. Does it not conclusively follow, that if Mr. Stuart's system is correct, hell at last must be peopled with the church; persons whom God hath redeemed by the death of his own beloved Son? I beg of him, and all our orthodox friends, to consider if this can be true. And if it is denied, that this conclusion follows, that they would be so kind as to show how they avoid it. If the Bible speaks of damned sinners in hell, who have been redeemed by the death of Christ, it has escaped my observation.

3. But let us inquire, to whom or to what Mr. Stuart refers, by '*the enemies of the church*,' in 1 Cor. 15, which he quotes above? Are they *persons*, or, are they *things*? It is of some importance to ascertain this. Let it then be observed, that throughout the whole chapter, the apostle does not mention in any shape wicked men, devils, or any other beings as *the enemies of the church*. But he mentions two *things* as enemies, over which at that period victory shall be obtained. He says, verses 55-57, 'O death where is thy sting? O grave (*hades*) where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be unto God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.' *Sin*, *death*, or the *grave*, are then the enemies of the church. But in the resurrection, they shall all be subdued, a complete victory obtained over them. Mr. Stuart seems to forget, that those whom he calls *the church*, are the persons Christ at that period has subdued. They were the enemies of God, whom Christ was exalted to subdue, and then he has subdued them. Nor will the church, which is Christ's body be complete, until all are subdued. Nor will Christ's work be completed,

until he has accomplished this. By Mr. Stuart's own shewing, God has placed Christ over the universe, has put all things under his feet to be subdued, or brought into subjection by him. And have we not seen, that beings in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, mean the whole universe, by Mr. Stuart's own confession? Moreover, has he not told us, that every knee, of those beings in heaven, earth, and under the earth, are to bow to Jesus. And can it be denied, that this bowing the knee to Jesus means spiritual and divine worship? Nor shall the period called *the end* come, until Christ 'shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet,' and to conclude this whole subjection, it is added—'The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' 1 Cor. xv: 24-27.

7. Moreover, Mr. Stuart says p. 127. 'John xvii: 3, 'And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only *true God*, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. The *true God* here seems to me, plainly, not opposed to, or contrasted with Christ; but, as every where else, in case this expression is used, *opposed to idols*. In the verse preceding, Christ says, 'Thou hast given me power over *all flesh*, that thou mightest bestow eternal life upon *all*, whom thou hast given me, i. e. both Gentiles and Jews.' On this paragraph we have several remarks to make.

1. How many did the Father give to Christ? How many did he give him power over, to bestow eternal life upon them? The passage answers—'Thou hast given me power over *all flesh*, that thou mightest bestow eternal life upon *all*, whom thou hast given me';—which Mr. Stuart explains thus: 'i. e. both Gentiles and Jews.' Now it is well known, *Gentiles* and *Jews* included the whole of mankind, the whole human race. The word *all*, occurs twice in the passage, which Mr. Stuart puts in capital letters; and the phrase *all flesh* occurs once, which, (to make his meaning the more conspicuous) he puts the word *all* in capitals, and the word *flesh* in italic letters. We then seriously ask Mr. Stuart, if

Christ has 'power given him over *all flesh*, that he might bestow eternal life upon *all* given him,' i. e. *Gentiles and Jews*,' where does he find his subjects for 'misery without relief and without end'? Can it be doubted, Mr. Stuart believes, that Gentiles and Jews are given to Jesus Christ? If he did not believe this, why all this flourish of capitals and italics? And if he did not, why give such an explanation of the word *all*, and the phrase *all flesh*? It is very certain, whether he does or not, his explanation accords with what Paul says, Rom. iii. 29, 30. 'Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also.'

But how many does the scripture say, were given to Christ? The following passages, among many others answer thus. 'Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.*' Psalm ii: 8. Again, 'All things (*panta*) are delivered unto me of my Father.' Matt. xi: 29. Luke x: 22. Again John iii: 35,—'The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things (*panta*) into his hands.' And John xiii. 3. 'Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things (*panta*) into his hands.' See in the Letters, and in our remarks above, what Mr. Stuart says of *panta*, *panton*, and *ta panta*. We shall also see presently, how many were given to Christ from another passage which we shall introduce.

* This surely does not mean, that God would give to Christ the territory of the heathen, their hills and vallies, etc. No, it says I will give thee the *heathen*, the people for thine inheritance: and the parallellism in the next part of the verse is—'And the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession,' which includes the whole heathen world. 'The land of Judea was considered the centre of the earth, where the Jews were located, and all the heathen nations surrounded them. It was never doubted that the Jews were God's peculiar people. But, to Jesus was also given the heathen for his possession. He is Lord of all; heir of all things. Will he permit the devil, or any other being, to rob him of a part of his inheritance? No. But according to old genuine orthodoxy, the devil was to have the greatest part of this inheritance. Now, orthodox people admit the devil's share is to be small, not more in proportion to Christ's, than those hung in any country are to the whole population of it.

2. But we doubt, whether the phrase '*eternal life*' here, or in any other part of the Bible, designates the immortal life after the resurrection. See my Second Inquiry, where I have attempted to shew, that this phrase designates the life or happiness enjoyed by believers in this world, and cannot be enjoyed but by believing. In the very passage Mr. Stuart quotes, it is said to consist in the knowledge of God and his Son, Jesus Christ. If it designates the immortal life after the resurrection, and none can enjoy it but such as were believers in this world, as orthodox people affirm, then all who die in infancy must be forever excluded. They were not believers, and from their being infants, the thing was impossible. So must the heathen be excluded, for how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard? Yet we have just seen the heathen were given to Christ for his inheritance. Indeed, if none are to enjoy future immortal life, but such as were believers in this world, one in a thousand saved are too many. This old *orthodoxy*, was too *liberal Christianity*, to correspond to the fact. All orthodox people now, may be termed '*very liberal Christians*.' They of late years, have approximated to the borders of Universalism. They must either come on to this ground altogether, or retrace their steps to ancient Calvinism. They cannot long abide where they are, for orthodox people at the South, tell their orthodox brethren at the North, that if they believed Christ died for all, they would also believe, all would be saved.

But the following passage demands some notice, as it stands closely connected with what we have just quoted from Mr. Stuart. It is John vi: 37-41. 'All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have

everlasting life : And I will raise him up at the last day.' I shall not stop to inquire, what our Lord meant by his coming down from heaven, as it does not concern our present subject. I shall also take it for granted, that by the phrase *last day*, twice used in these verses, the period of the resurrection of the dead is designated. This I presume will not be disputed, by Mr. Stuart.

It is very obvious from the context of this passage, that our Lord was reasoning with the Jews, concerning their unbelief in him as the Messiah. He says to them, verse 36 : 'But I said unto you, that ye also have seen me and believe not.' They as a nation rejected him, notwithstanding the proofs he gave them, that he was their long expected Messiah. But was their unbelief to defeat the design of his mission? No ; says the apostle, Rom. iii : 3, 4, 'For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid : yea let God be true, but every man a liar.' 1. Their unbelief as a nation, could not prevent the remnant according to the election of grace, (Rom. ii : 5,) coming to him then. No ; our Lord says in verse 39,—'All that the Father giveth me (now*) shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.' The election shall obtain this, and the rest are blinded. Rom. xi : 7. What our Lord meant by coming to him, he explains in verse 35, to be believing on him ; the same as stated verse 40, 'Seeing the Son, believing on him, and enjoying everlasting life.' The unbelief of the nation generally, could not prevent the election of grace from coming to him then, or being given to him as the first fruits. They would come to him, and notwithstanding their former unbelief, he would in no wise cast them out.

2. Our Lord also assured the Jews, that their unbelief could not defeat his mission. No, not until their unbe-

* The sense here I think is, giveth me *now*. The tense of the verb shews this. Our Lord is not speaking here of all the Father had given him in the most extensive sense. Of this he speaks verse 39, as we shall presently see, and is spoken of in the past tense thus—'That of all which he *hath given* me I should lose nothing.'

lief could defeat the will and purposes of God. But this it could not do, for Peter told the Jews, Acts vi: 28, that their unbelief only accomplished, 'Whatsoever his hand and counsel determined before to be done.' And our Lord here, in verses 38-40, says to them—'For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Fathers will, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the Father's will, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life: And I will raise him up at the last day.'

The principal subject in these verses is, *the design and ultimate end of Christ's mission*. He positively denies, that he came down from heaven 'to do his own will,' and as positively affirms, that he came to do 'the will of the Father who sent him.' What then was his Father's will? This question he answers in verses 39, 40 just quoted. It divides itself into two parts. I. He says in verse 39—'And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.' The first question to be considered is—How many had the Father given to Christ? Mr. Stuart answers, as in the passage he quotes, *all, all flesh*, which he explains thus, '*i. e. both Gentiles and Jews.*' And in the Letters, and remarks above, we have seen, that he says, '*ta panta*' means '*the universe*'; that 'God has placed him over the creation'; 'appointed him heir of all things (*ta panta*)'; and is to 'reconcile all things (*ta panta*) to himself by Jesus Christ.' Heb. i. 2. Col. i. 19, 20. See also the passages above, which all agree to Mr. Stuart's statements, that 'both Gentiles and Jews' were given to Christ.

The next question is,—will Christ lose any of them whom the Father gave him? This he explicitly denies. He says, it was his Father's will—'that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing.' Christ, evidently then could not do his Father's will, if he did lose any of them. If he lost any of them, he would fail in accom-

plicing the mission on which his Father sent him. He cannot fail in accomplishing this, for lack of either power or inclination, according to Mr. Stuart's own shewing, as we have seen above, none are able to pluck them out his, or his Father's hand. John x. 28, 29. The tenets of old orthodoxy, were not so inconsistent, as to suppose, that any given to Christ would be lost. No, the endless damnation of sinners, was held on the ground, that such sinners were never given to Christ, but that God passed them by, or decreed their endless misery. But now, modern orthodoxy, even Mr. Stuart admits, *all, all flesh, both Gentiles and Jews*, were given to Christ, yet he contends all are not to be saved. What is to be the end of these modern improvements in orthodoxy?

The next question is—what did Christ mean by not *losing* any of those the Father gave him. This he answers in the words—‘But shall raise it up again at the last day.’ He plainly intimates, that if any of those whom the Father gave him, were not raised up by him, they would be lost. But he declares, ‘this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose, (*apoleso*) nothing.’ If not raised up at the last day they would be lost, or ‘perished,’ (*apolonto*), as Paul declares, 1 Cor. xv. 18. Here then our Lord refutes in the same sentence, the doctrines of annihilation and endless misery; for if any in the last day are not raised up, or are raised to endless punishment, they must be lost. Here would be lost sheep, lost from the fold of God forever; whom Christ the great shepherd of the sheep, is never to bring back to it. Mr. Stuart must then prove, that there were some the Father never gave to Christ, or universal salvation is indisputable. But should he attempt to prove this, he must first retract some of his statements. For example, ‘*all, all flesh, i. e. Gentiles and Jews*,’ he admits were given to Christ, and Gentiles and Jews include the whole human race. He has got none, therefore, either to annihilate or make forever miserable at the last day, by his own obvious statements. I know something of *old orthodoxy*, but I

know nothing in *modern orthodoxy*, which can scripturally or rationally account, for all being given to Christ, yet some of them must be miserable 'without relief and without end.'

But it will probably be objected—'Must not Judas be lost? For does not our Lord say concerning him, John xvii. 12, 'Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scriptures might be fulfilled.' No; for all must see, that if Judas was lost, not raised up at the last day, this would plainly contradict what our Lord says, 'That of all which the Father hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.' It will then be asked, how is this apparent contradiction between the two statements to be reconciled? I answer, the context of John xvii. 12, very clearly and easily reconciles it. There, our Lord is speaking of his apostles. See v. 9, 10, 11, where he prays for them; and adds in verse 12, 'While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me (as apostles) I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition.' Judas was the only one lost from the apostleship, for all the other apostles continued steadfast unto death. He fell from the apostleship by his transgression, not that he might fall into hell, but that the scriptures might be fulfilled, see Psalm cix. It could easily be shown more fully, that Judas being lost, referred to his being lost from the apostleship, but I deem this here unnecessary. We return to the passage in question.

On this verse, we have one or two remarks more to make. 1. Nothing is said in it about seeing the Son, believing on him, or having everlasting life. Why? Because Christ here speaks of all given to him of his Father, in the most extensive and unqualified sense, without any regard either to their faith or their unbelief. All are included whether Jew or Gentile, infant or adult, believer or unbeliever. They were given to him, and he is to lose none of them, but raise them up at the last day. This view of the words, accords

with Mr. Stuart's statements noticed in the preceding pages; that Christ is placed over the creation; that he is Lord of all; is to subdue all; and is Lord of the dead and living. And the connexion of the whole passage, seems to lead to this view, for if verse 39 speaks only of believers being given to Christ, verse 40 speaks also of them, and would look like tautology.

2. Being raised up by Christ at the last day, is that, which all given to him are to enjoy. This is not what the scriptures mean by 'everlasting life,' for in the 40th verse, it is distinguished from everlasting life, which is here enjoyed, and only enjoyed by believers. 'Every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life.' This will appear by a brief notice of verse 40.

'And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: And I will raise him up at the last day.' To suppose here, that the same number of persons are meant, as in verse 39, would limit the number given to Christ, to such as have seen him and believed in him. But surely this is not true, for comparatively few ever saw Christ, and a vast number of the human race never had the opportunity to believe in him. If none except those who saw Christ, and shall believe in him, are to be raised by him in the last day, the number given to him is small. Besides, I ask, are none to be raised in the last day by Christ, except such as in this world believed in him? If so, then infants, idiots, the heathen world and most in Christian lands, must perish forever. But who will venture to advocate such a doctrine?

But notice what is said in this 40th verse. It is said 'Every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life.' Nothing like this was said in verse 39. Why? Because it spoke of all given to Christ, many of whom never saw him or believed in him in this world. This 40th verse, only speaks of that portion of those given to Christ, who should be favored with seeing him and believing in his

name. And this view of the passage, is confirmed from the fact, that *everlasting life* in scripture is connected with believing; and does not designate the future immortal life but the spiritual or moral life of a believer in this world.

Dr. Woods on this text, in his Letters to Unitarians p. 56, says:—

‘Those who *are given* to Christ, and those who *shall come* to Christ, are here identified. Indeed, the passage plainly signifies, that, in every case, a person’s being given to Christ *secures* his coming to Christ; a circumstance which fixes one point; namely; that those who will finally be saved, are given to Christ *before* they come to him. From v. 39, we have additional proof that, when Christ speaks of those who were given him of the Father, he includes the whole number that shall be saved. ‘This is the Father’s will,—that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.’ The work of Christ, as a Saviour, doubtless extends alike to all, who shall be raised to eternal life at the last day. But this work of his is here represented as relating to those, whom the Father hath given him. From the whole it seems evident, that when Christ speaks so familiarly, in John xvii. of those who were given him, he refers to all who shall be saved.’

It is evident enough from this paragraph, that Dr. Woods must become a Universalist, as soon as he believes all were given to Christ. He declares ‘The work of Christ, as a Saviour, doubtless extends alike to all, who shall be raised to eternal life at the last day.’ And that, ‘From v. 39, we have additional proof, that, when Christ speaks of those, who were given him of the Father, he includes the whole number that shall be saved.’ All that prevents him from Universalism is, he does not seem to think that all mankind were given to Christ. The difficulty in the Dr’s. mind, respecting the salvation of all, seems to arise from the following things.

1. He supposes that in the passage—‘those who *are given* to Christ, and those who *shall come* to Christ, are here identified.’ But how then can he save a single in-

fant who dies in infancy, for certainly they do not come to Christ in this world. All of them must be lost, cannot be raised up by Christ in the last day, unless he supposes that they come to Christ after death. And if he does, the same thing can be supposed of all adults who die in unbelief. Even if infants who die in infancy were given to Christ, they must perish, for they never came to Christ. They are damned, for not performing a thing, which was impossible in their infantile state. But it is certain from the Dr's. own statements, that infants dying in infancy cannot be saved, for he says—'the passage plainly signifies; that, in every case, a persons being given to Christ *secures* his coming to Christ; a circumstance which fixes one point; namely; that those who will finally be saved, are given to Christ before they come to him.' Infants then, cannot be saved, for had they been given to Christ, this would have secured their coming to him. Moreover, I suggest it for the Dr's. consideration, if he does not cast all the blame on God, of men's not being saved. How could those ever come to Christ, or believe on him, who were never given to him, seeing that being given to him *secures* men's salvation. Indeed, *before* they can come to him, they must have been previously given to him, as he positively asserts.

2. Another difficulty, or mistake in the Dr's. mind is, he thinks *eternal life*, is that life, all are to enjoy in the resurrection state. But this cannot be correct, for is the resurrection life enjoyed by those who believe in this world? Surely not; but can any thing be more obvious from scripture, than that all who believe enjoy *everlasting life* in this world? But do believers become *immortal*, on their believing in Christ? No, they enjoy a spiritual and moral life, which some even think may be lost, and they may after all die in unbelief and be eternally damned.

To give Dr. Woods his due, his system is consistent. He believes—'the work of Christ, as a Saviour, doubtless extends alike to all' who are to be saved; and these only are, all who come to Christ; and their being given

to Christ, *secures* their coming to him. But many of his orthodox brethren, and Professor Stuart among them, believe all men are redeemed by Christ, yet all will not be saved. But did Christ redeem any not given to him? Believe all were given to him, and all such difficulties are removed. We submit our views of the above passage for a candid consideration, whether it does not teach, that all are *given* to Christ, and all shall be saved by him, raised up at the last day. Do not Mr. Stuart's statements, noticed in the preceding pages, go to prove that my view of this passage is correct?

I am aware, that Mr. Stuart and others, may make some objections to my remarks on the statements made in the preceding pages. Such as have been suggested to me I shall now briefly notice.

1. Adults are actual transgressors, but infants are not; of course, what is said in the Bible, respecting faith and repentance being necessary to salvation, does not apply to them? Dr. Spring would not admit this, for he maintains, that a new-born babe is an actual transgressor; that he knows of no other sin, but actual transgression. But let this pass as a novelty in orthodoxy. Permit me then to ask, since a new-born babe may die, and be saved without faith or repentance on what ground is it saved? Or, does it need any salvation? If it does, from what is it saved? If it does not need any salvation, how can Christ be its Saviour; or how can it ever sing the song of the redeemed? Now as all admit infants are saved, yea, contend all those dying in infancy are saved without faith or repentance, what is to hinder all adults dying in unbelief from being saved on the same ground as they are? It cannot be their actual transgressions, in distinction from infants, who have none, for in this case the best saints could not be saved. Have they no actual transgressions? They have, as all their neighbors know, and as they themselves confess in their daily prayers to God. Are they not constantly telling God, what vile and sinful creatures they are? It cannot be, for want of being redeemed by the death of Christ, for we have seen from Professor Stuart, that he

believes all mankind have been redeemed by his death. I then press the question, what *hinders* the salvation of any of our race? The want of being redeemed cannot hinder it. Actual transgression does not hinder it in believers. Nor does the want of faith and repentance in infants. Nor can the want of willingness hinder it, for infants have no will about it. We do not see, why God may not save us, as well as create us, without consulting us. And if he created all things for his own pleasure, why not save all for the same reason. Has not the potter power over his clay, and if the vessels have been marred by sin in this state, cannot he remedy all this in the resurrection state? The preceding pages, go to shew he has promised to do it.

2. It may be objected—this doctrine leads to licentiousness. If all are to be raised to immortal life and glory in the resurrection, will not men say—‘Let us sin because grace aboundeth?’ We reply with the apostle, ‘God forbid, for how shall we who are dead to sin live any longer therein?’ If men turn the grace of God into lasciviousness, is his grace to blame? And *must* we pervert it, lest they should do so? If we do, we are not following the apostles, for they heard the same objection urged, yet continued to preach the exceeding riches of God’s grace! They knew, this grace when received, taught men to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, etc. This is proved by facts. Who, pray, live the most moral lives? Is it not those, who know the grace of God in truth? It is God’s love and impartial grace, which constrains them to love and to good works. The very thing, the objection supposes leads to licentiousness, is that which produces true holiness. But

3. It may be objected, if all are raised immortal in the resurrection, and are to be forever happy after it, what advantage has the believer in Jesus? I answer much every way, chiefly, because believers in him have peace with God, everlasting consolation and good hope through grace. See Rom. v. 1, etc. 2 Thess. ii. 16. 17. They find, that in the keeping of God’s commandments there is a great reward. That wisdom’s ways are ways of

pleasantness and all her paths are peace. As no true believer, can urge seriously such an objection, we deem it unworthy of much notice. If any man thinks, he ought to be rewarded with heaven for his faith here, it proves his faith has done him little good. It shews, he is not serving God for nought. He is making God his debtor, and there is no proportion between the work performed, and the wages he expects. It would be the greatest prodigality in God, to comply with his demand. It would lead to boasting, but all boasting is excluded, and he that glories must glory only in the Lord.

4. It is often objected--do you not see men die every day in their sins, and some of *them* in the act of committing the worst crimes; how can such persons be fit for heaven? Answer. Who says they are fit for heaven? Not I, for I never held any such opinion. If I am asked, what am I to do with them? I answer, just what you must do with the best saint. Is not he a sinner when he dies? And do not some good people die in the act of committing small crimes? Well, I ask in turn, what are you to do with them? If you say their good deeds ought to take them to heaven, on your own principles I say, their bad deeds ought to send them to hell. Did such good people, ever do more than their duty? No, for you allow they are sinners, but small sinners, compared with some others. How then can God send such persons to heaven, who are at least *little sinners*?

But should you say, the saints go to heaven altogether on the ground of free grace, I answer very well. But remember, it is as sinners they go there, saved by free grace; and if the chief of sinners are saved in this way, what pray is to hinder the characters named in your objection, to be saved by the same grace? What claim has one sinner more than another on this grace? And, it is any thing but humility, for a few *small sinners*, to monopolize all this grace to themselves. There is no occasion for this, for God's riches of grace is sufficient for all. And being *small sinners*, they will only need a little of this grace to save them, leaving a super abundance for the *great sinners*, whom you think ought to be

sent to hell. Why should your eye be evil because God is good? But what is all the difference, between little sinners and the worst sinners? It is—the one owes fifty, and the other five hundred pence. But both are in the same predicament, for neither have ought to pay? And both having nothing to pay, God frankly forgives them both. See Luke vii. 36—49. Cannot God do with his own what he pleases?

It seems to be a mistake, and the above objection is founded on it, that saints are fit for heaven, at their death. But does the article of death, purge them from all their sin and corruption, yet leaves very wicked sinners in all their pollution? Or, is there a purgatory, into which saints go, to fit them for heaven, while very wicked sinners are sent directly to hell? If there is, what scripture writer teaches such a doctrine? I must greatly misunderstand my Bible, if any are fitted for heaven, whether they died saints or sinners, until they are raised immortal and glorious in the resurrection. If I am mistaken, let it be shewn, how or by what process, an imperfect sinful man called a saint, is fitted for heaven after death before the resurrection. Perhaps I may find, that this is the same process, by which God prepares the most ungodly wretch that ever died at Tyburn.

5. But I find some also object, saying—‘All are to be raised in the resurrection just as they died. They are to be raised, with the same moral characters, feelings, and attainments they had at death.’ If this be true, and if there is a hell in the intermediate state, it is also true, no moral improvement need be expected there. But I must be permitted to ask, where shall I learn from the Bible such opinions? I can find nothing which gives the least countenance to them, and I am not very fond of receiving them on mere human authority. But, admit for a moment they are true, what follows? It follows, that all saints are raised, with all their sins, ignorance, superstition, and sectarian feelings about them. And are you to take them to heaven in this state? If you do, you will have as many sects there as we have here, and similar sectarian feelings. This objection

then, if it proves any thing, proves too much for the objector.

This view of men's characters in the resurrection, is of modern invention, and is predicated on the principle of analogy. But if we admit it, we must make the resurrection world, similar to the present. Those who contend, that persons there will go on progressing in virtue and goodness, forget that some may also retrograde, on their principle of analogy. But what the means of improvement are to be there, we have no explicit information from them. Oh how long will it be, before we all come to learn like little children, our religion from the Bible, not seeking to be wise above what is written.

6. The last objection I shall notice is—men are free agents, and if they are not willing to use it to be saved, they deserve to be miserable forever. On this I have only room for two brief remarks.

1. Is any man such a free agent, that he can exert his free agency, so as to defeat the purposes of Jehovah? If he is, then he is above Jehovah, and it is man's free agency which governs the universe. Say, if it is God's purpose to save all mankind, can man's free agency so alter his purpose, that only a part can be saved, or that the whole may be damned. If not, then man's free agency is under God's control.

2. Is man such a free agent, that by the exertion of it, he can even alter the agents by which God designs to accomplish his purposes? For example, could the Jews have so exerted their free agency, that they could have believed in Christ instead of crucifying him? Peter denies this. Acts iv. 27, 28. If man by all his boasted free agency, cannot do either of these things, we have nothing to fear from it. If men say, they can believe if they please, and love God if they please, the best thing which can be said to them is—why then do you not always please to do this?

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.

FOR SALE AT THE FOLLOWING STORES:

B. B. Mussey's; Marsh Capen & Lyon; Baker & Alexander's; R. P. & C. Williams; Munroe & Francis; Josiah Loring's, and at the Trumpet Office, Boston. Also, by the Author Charlestown, and in the principal cities and towns in the union.

1. His First Inquiry into the sense of the original terms rendered *Hell*, in the common version. In cloth \$1.

2. His Reply to Sabine's Lectures on the Inquiry. 50. cents.*

3. His Second Inquiry, into the doctrine of Scripture concerning the Devil and Satan, and the duration expressed by the terms *Oulm*, *Aion*, and *Aionios*, rendered everlasting, etc. Boards \$1. In sheep \$1 25.

4. Three Essays, on the Intermediate State of the Dead, the Resurrection from the Dead, and on the Greek terms rendered Judgment, Damned, Damnation, etc. With remarks on Mr. Hudson's Letters, etc. Boards \$1, Bound \$1 25.

5. Letter to Dr. Allen, President of Bowdoin College, in reply to his Lecture on Universal Salvation, addressed to the Students of the College. 25 cents.*

6. Letters on the Immortality of the Soul, the Intermediate State of the Dead, and a Future Retribution, in reply to Mr. Charles Hudson, etc. Boards \$1. Bound, \$1 25.

7. Reply to Professor Stuart's Exegetical Essays. In cloth 75 cents.*

Orders for the above works, addressed to the Author, Charlestown, will be punctually and faithfully executed. One third discount will be made for Cash, and twenty per cent. allowed responsible persons, to sell on Commission.

* Very few of the works marked thus, remain on hand for sale.

Preparing for, and will be put to press in a few weeks—'A Letter to the Rev. Bernard Whitman, on the term *Gehenna*, rendered *Hell* in the New Testament; in reply to his Sixth 'Friendly Letter to a Universalist.' In this Letter, Mr. Whitman covertly attacks my First Inquiry, and to it I confine my remarks. Claiming the right of self defence, I leave the rest of his book to be replied to by the Universalist whom he addresses, or until he complies with conditions which will be stated.











LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 897 892 7